United Nations S PV 6299

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6299th meeting

Friday, 16 April 2010, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Okada	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Alkalaj
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	France	Mr. Araud
	Gabon	Mr. Issoze-Ngondet
	Lebanon	Mr. Salam
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Apakan
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-31721 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

The President: I wish to welcome the presence at this meeting of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, His Excellency Mr. Sven Alkalaj.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, the Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Uruguay, in which they request that their delegations be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of those countries to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to His Excellency Mr. Zalmai Rassoul, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan; His Excellency Mr. Alfred Palo Conteh, Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone; and Her Excellency Ms. Lucia Lobato, Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Wittig to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank.

It is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from His Excellency Mr. Pedro Serrano, in which he requests to be invited, in his capacity as acting head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Pedro Serrano.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite Mr. Serrano to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 14 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations, in which he requests that the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Téte António, be invited to participate in the consideration of the item in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Téte António.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. António to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/2010/167, which contains a letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper for this debate.

I should now like to make an opening statement in my national capacity.

It is a great honour for me to convene an open debate of the Security Council on a very important topic — post-conflict peacebuilding. At the outset, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and to the ministers and special guests who have travelled a great distance to share their experience and insights at this meeting.

How do conflicts recur even after a ceasefire is successfully concluded? Why does peace not take root in post-conflict countries? These are critical issues to which the international community has yet to find a definitive answer. I believe that the key to solving them is for people in a post-conflict situation to have hope for the future. To this end, how can political stability and security be achieved in parallel with social stability? How can a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy be created, with the assistance of the international community? I look forward to a lively discussion on these points.

When we think about peacebuilding, we should first of all emphasize the importance of political leaders implementing a peace agreement with steadfast determination. It is also important that the fruits of democratic elections, which include political stability, be shared among all the people, including those who did not prevail, and not simply be reserved for the winners. This requires as its foundation the achievement of peaceful coexistence and reconciliation among parties to the conflict. In the States that comprised the former Yugoslavia, especially Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was most heavily affected by the conflict, continuous efforts have been made to that end. Afghanistan, where self-reliant efforts are being made for reconciliation and reintegration, also requires the support and cooperation of the international community.

With regard to security, peacekeeping operations have a significant role to play and lay the groundwork for promoting security sector reform. The building of national police force capacity is an especially urgent task, for instance, in Haiti and Timor-Leste.

We recently lost many of our dear colleagues in the earthquake in Haiti, including Mr. Hedi Annabi, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and another friend, Mr. Takahisa Kawakami, in Dili last month, who, as the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General at the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT), had not yet fulfilled his aspiration to build the national police of that young nation. I call upon the international community to continue the efforts of these dedicated United Nations staff members by striving harder to enhance national police capacity in many post-conflict countries.

In order to break the vicious circle of social instability and prevent the recurrence of conflicts, it is important that conflict-affected people be provided with basic services and thereby enjoy a peace dividend. It is essential, from the viewpoint of human security, to protect and empower individuals, including women and the vulnerable. Refugees, internally displaced persons and ex-combatants must be reintegrated into society. We need to generate conditions that are conducive to making peace irreversible through promoting coexistence and reconciliation.

Youth unemployment is a common issue of serious concern in many countries in the post-conflict stage. I therefore propose that, when assistance is extended to such countries, high priority be attached to the creation of youth employment. Young people represent the future of a country. They should not take up weapons but rather engage in productive work, which will enable them to participate in the reconstruction of their nation and its communities. Thus, they can provide a foundation for socio-economic development, which will lead to the true consolidation of peace.

Creating a long-lasting peace requires sustained cooperation between a post-conflict country and the international community. In this connection, I would like to highlight three points.

First, we should think about how efforts for peacebuilding can be carried out in an integrated manner. In Sierra Leone, the Peacebuilding Commission and the Government of Sierra Leone made concerted efforts to formulate a Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework, which included such socio-economic development measures as energy assistance,

together with measures to create political stability and security. The international community is currently assisting the country under this framework. A framework of this kind should serve as a model for other peacebuilding strategies.

Secondly, the assistance and involvement of the international community may have conflicting impacts on the ownership efforts of a post-conflict country. For instance, will provision of food assistance be consistent with efforts to promote domestic agricultural production? Will the pursuit of justice by the international community advance the effort for national reconciliation? Does the hiring of local experts by international programmes affect the national Government's efforts at capacity-building? If we overlook these issues, the fundamental goal of building the country's self-reliance will not be achieved. The international community must respect the ownership and capacity-building efforts of the post-conflict country.

Thirdly, peacebuilding requires long-term engagement and sustainable resources. We first need to make the best possible use of funds available for the immediate aftermath of a conflict — for example, the Peacebuilding Fund. But such funds must be followed by medium- and long-term resources from bilateral and multilateral programmes. It is also essential to secure and strengthen necessary expertise to serve the diverse requirements of peacebuilding activities, including in the areas of governance and the rule of law. In this regard, we look forward to the work of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities, launched by the Secretary-General last month.

The Security Council must continue its strong engagement in favour of peacebuilding, and we hope to see the Peacebuilding Commission obtain enhanced results through the ongoing review process. Building on today's debate, Japan will continue to participate actively in the efforts towards achieving sustainable peace in post-conflict countries.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council. I now invite His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: Thank you, Minister Okada, for taking part in person in this very important Security Council debate and for focusing the attention of the Council on this important subject. I congratulate the delegation of Japan for its success in presiding over the work of the Security Council this month.

In our previous debates, a consensus has emerged on some of the factors leading to success in post-conflict peacebuilding. The report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict that I presented to this Council last July laid them out in some detail (S/2009/304). We must seize the crucial opportunity that is presented at the end of a major conflict. We must respond early and robustly. And we must then stay engaged over the long term. We have also agreed that our collective efforts must be tailored to the needs of each country.

Today I would like to emphasize three points in order to situate our discussion in a larger context.

First, we build peace in the minds and hearts of people. This means delivering concrete peace dividends. Peace will not last unless people see real benefits in their daily lives: safety, justice, jobs and prospects for a better future. In this regard, our work must always be guided by the principle of national ownership.

Secondly, peace will not endure unless Governments in post-conflict countries are able to perform the basic functions of the State and to ensure sustainable security. These functions include policing the streets, upholding the rule of law, establishing a functioning justice and corrections system and delivering basic services. Governments should also be capable of demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants, developing a professional security sector and protecting civilians from death and injuries caused by landmines.

Thirdly, we must take a comprehensive approach. That means addressing the security, political, economic and social dimensions. It means engaging national, bilateral, regional and international actors, and it means coherence, coordination and common vision.

The United Nation continues to sharpen its work. We are building partnerships and synergies across the United Nations system and with regional and international actors, with an emphasis on early engagement. This includes a stronger partnership with the World Bank and other international financial institutions.

We are bolstering our capacity to support viable peace processes that produce durable agreements. We are improving our tools for deploying and supporting peacekeeping operations, integrated peacebuilding offices and other field operations that take on peacebuilding tasks.

We are paying more attention to the nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Peacekeepers themselves are, in an important sense, early peacebuilders. They seize the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict. They are the first to set priorities. We must take advantage of their unique yet temporary presence while remaining aware that peacekeepers do not have the resources for long-term development.

The Secretariat is working on a strategy to ensure that critical early peacebuilding tasks, carried out by peacekeepers and others, contribute to longer-term peacebuilding and development. In doing this, we want to draw on the assets of all partners, in particular those from the South.

To this end and following through on one of the recommendations contained in last year's report (S/2009/304), I have asked the Peacebuilding Support Office to conduct a review of civilian capacities for peacebuilding. I have also appointed a Senior Advisory Group, chaired by the former Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Affairs, Mr. Guéhenno. I understand that the Peacebuilding Commission will also provide input to this review, thus ensuring that we capture the views of a broad and unique segment of the membership.

Timely funding is essential. It is vital to have adequate and timely resources for early peacebuilding tasks, including, if necessary, the rapid deployment of standing police and other civilian capacities.

Last year, the Peacebuilding Fund revised its terms of reference so that it would be better positioned to provide the kind of flexible, rapid and predictable resources envisaged in my 2009 report. Since its inception in late 2006, the Fund has provided resources to 16 countries. Eighty-eight per cent of this funding has gone to countries with either peacekeeping missions or political and peacebuilding missions.

The Peacebuilding Fund also serves as a pillar of support for the Peacebuilding Commission, with approximately $106 million allocated to the four countries on the Commission's agenda. I am pleased to announce that this month the Fund will reach $200 million in allocations. With 48 donors and nearly $350 million in deposits and pledges, the Fund continues to make progress, including through the guidance provided by its Advisory Group.

However, the Peacebuilding Fund's value is in identifying priority areas and helping to channel resources to them. By itself, it can not meet the financial needs of countries emerging from conflict.

I therefore urge donor countries to increase their support as bilateral donors, through direct contributions to countries emerging from conflict and as multilateral donors, through the international financial institutions or United Nations agencies on the ground.

The ongoing review of the peacebuilding arrangements agreed to in 2005 is an opportunity to strengthen our work in important ways. Peacebuilding is a complex and multifaceted undertaking. It requires significant amounts of human, financial and institutional resources. But the most important tool we can deploy is the political commitment of national and international actors.

The Security Council has a central role to play. As peacekeeping mandates increasingly include peacebuilding responsibilities, I urge Council members to ensure that the resources provided are commensurate with the tasks assigned, and I urge them to use their great influence and experience to help peacebuilding achieve its potential.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement. I now give the floor to Mr. Zalmai Rassoul, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan.

Mr. Rassoul (Afghanistan): First of all, let me extend my congratulations to you, Minister Okada, and your country for assuming the presidency of the Council for this month, and thank you for convening this meeting and inviting me to participate. I would also like to thank His Excellency the Secretary-General for his presence here today.

The rebuilding of societies emerging from conflict is one of the biggest challenges to the maintenance of international peace and security and thus among the most important functions of this Council and this Organization. It is also of central

importance to Afghanistan, which struggles on a daily basis to establish peace and security.

In Afghanistan, reconstruction and stabilization efforts began immediately after the fall of the Taliban at the end of 2001. When we first gathered in December 2001 in Bonn, Germany, we began a process that, in five years, would put Afghanistan back on the path towards an enduring stability. Though we were astonishingly successful in achieving the benchmarks set by the Bonn process, we soon acknowledged that further efforts would be necessary to address the magnitude of the challenges we faced. In Tokyo in 2002, London in 2006 and Paris in 2008, we adapted our plans to emerging realities and extended our efforts towards establishing a secure, stable and prosperous Afghanistan.

After three decades of war, Afghanistan's economy was decimated, the State had disintegrated, and the society was bereft of infrastructure or even the most basic necessities of life. Millions had died. Millions more were forced to flee from their country — among them, a large number of technocrats and educated Afghans.

Continuous conflict during this period crippled the social fabric of the country. Further, the ongoing political and social instability bred networks of terrorists, extremists, criminals, drug dealers and opportunistic regional elements that depend on insecurity in Afghanistan and the region. A nexus of drugs, extremism and crime fed on the chaos and anarchy that now seriously threatens our efforts to build peace.

Despite the challenges, we have achieved remarkable success in nine years, establishing a convincing basis for optimism for the future of the country. Afghans have forcefully renounced the totalitarian rule of the Taliban and established a Government through three successful elections, including the most recent presidential election, run entirely by Afghans. The Afghan Government is becoming more efficient and effective every day, and is increasing its capacity to provide governance and services to the people. More than three quarters of Afghans now have access to basic health care. Millions of children now have the opportunity to attend school, many for the first time.

We have addressed the legacy of violence through a comprehensive disarmament and reintegration programme that has successfully reintegrated thousands of former fighters into society. In particular, I would like to recognize and offer thanks for the efforts of Japan in that area, including through the financing of programmes for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and the disbandment of illegal and armed groups, as well as for hosting a comprehensive conference on peace and reconciliation in Tokyo last November. In addition, we have built and continue to improve the Afghan National Army and Police through recruiting, training and equipping. They are beginning to take primary responsibility for providing security for the people and the country.

In rebuilding Afghanistan's shattered infrastructure, we have built thousands of miles of roads with the help of the Council, as well as hundreds of schools and clinics, local wells, and improved irrigation systems. We have seen immense economic growth. This year, for the first time, the Afghan Government has taken in more than $1 billion in revenues. The average Afghan income has jumped six-fold in the past four years.

Change has also come in ways that are not visible. The Afghan people are more vocal, more engaged and more involved in the future of their country than ever before. We have a vibrant media, an active civil society and well-informed citizens. Social structures are beginning to re-knit and a feeling of national unity is emerging.

We are proud of our accomplishments to date, but we still face daunting challenges. Security remains Afghanistan's number one challenge. Terrorists are still intent on jeopardizing our progress and are trying to take Afghanistan back to the days of tyranny and oppression. In stabilizing Afghanistan, we know that military means are essential. Nonetheless, they are not the only answer. That is why we have embarked upon a comprehensive strategy that includes military, political and economic efforts.

As an important element of our security strategy, the role of international forces and the manner in which they operate are crucial. More needs to be done to ensure the protection of civilian populations. We emphasize the need for the utmost care and precision during combat operations to avoid civilian casualties. It is also essential that international forces conduct their duties with strict adherence to cultural sensitivities and in close coordination with Afghan security forces. By

the same token, we appreciate the new approach of NATO Commander General Stanley McChrystal, which places added emphasis on the protection of the civilian population.

To achieve success in defeating terrorism and improving security, more focus is required to address the main sources of insecurity. The problem of insecurity will not be solved so long as terrorist sanctuaries and safe havens in the region continue to provide terrorists with ideological, financial and logistical support.

Regional cooperation is another essential element in achieving stability in Afghanistan. We continue our collaboration with regional countries — bilaterally, trilaterally and through other forums — to overcome the challenges in Afghanistan and in the region.

Going forward, we must work to ensure the sustainability of our progress economically, politically and socially. Much remains to be done. We must build the capacity of the Afghan Government and the strength of its institutions so that it can stand on its own feet. We still must focus more on improving good governance and fighting corruption. We must guarantee the long-term security of the Afghan people and more fully win their confidence. And we must foster the social well-being that is necessary for stability and peace.

A few months ago, at the beginning of his new term, President Karzai proposed a strategy that was subsequently endorsed by the international community in London at the end of January. That strategy is focused on building lasting, sustainable peace and stability in the coming three to five years through the Afghanization of national ownership and leadership, by empowering and engaging Afghans themselves, by promoting long-term socio-economic development, and by undertaking new regional cooperation.

First, if peace is to be sustainable, Afghans should be involved in their own security. The Afghan national security forces will play a central role. In the coming three to five years, intensified training and recruitment will enable those forces to begin to take the primary responsibility for the security and defence of the country and its citizens, thereby allowing the international community's role to evolve from a primary to a supporting one.

Secondly, the Government of Afghanistan will engage more fully with all Afghan people and address their concerns in order to strengthen national unity and social stability. Improved capacity will allow the Government of Afghanistan to address corruption, strengthen good governance, end the culture of impunity and better serve the Afghan people.

Thirdly, we will offer former combatants and those willing to join the peace process a chance for a peaceful life and a decent future through a reconciliation and reintegration process. That is a good alternative for ending the continuing insecurity in parts of the conflict and an important way of isolating extremists and terrorists and ensuring that Afghans will continue to choose peace over violence.

Fourthly, although those elements will promote peace and stabilization, the only way to guarantee the sustainability of progress is to anchor society on a foundation of long-term socio-economic development. The Government of Afghanistan must be able to fund its programmes, support its people and decrease its dependence on international aid. Job creation and agricultural development in particular are central elements that will cement short-term gains, improve social cohesiveness and promote political normalization. In addition, there must be a focus on education to help build capacity, promote social stability and confront extremism.

A crucial piece of the London strategy is the central role of the Government of Afghanistan in coordinating and leading those efforts as Afghans take greater responsibility for their country. With regard to development assistance, a much better job is required to improve its efficiency. To date, only 20 per cent of such aid has gone through Afghanistan's national budget; 80 per cent of assistance has been channelled on a bilateral basis. In short, we must Afghanize development priorities.

Through improved coordination, we should work to address parallel or competing governance structures, which do more harm than good.

President Karzai's new Afghanization strategy is built upon a workable and reliable partnership between the Government of Afghanistan and the international community. My Government and the Afghan people are very grateful for the continuing commitment and generosity of our international partners and friends. We

recognize that a partnership based on respect and realism is vital to our success.

Understandably, we have different expectations, different timelines and different priorities. We can avoid fragmentation and confusion only through mutual understanding, open communication and an awareness of our shared goals. Our efforts will take time to bear fruit. This process cannot be hurried. In addition to short-term measures, long-term development supported by a committed partnership with the international community is the key to a healthy and sustainable Afghan society that is safe from the risk of recurring conflict.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Alfred Palo Conteh, Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Conteh (Sierra Leone): At the outset, my delegation wishes to congratulate you most warmly, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We assure you of our full support and cooperation during your tenure. I would also like to extend our appreciation to your predecessor for his able leadership in directing the work of the Council during the past month. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his presence at this debate.

My delegation also wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the Permanent Mission of Japan for organizing this open debate of the Security Council on the topic of post-conflict peacebuilding and developing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict. The Government of Sierra Leone appreciates this opportunity to participate in deliberations focused on shaping a comprehensive global strategy on this important issue.

Before I proceed, allow me to convey the profound regrets of my colleague, Foreign Minister Zainab Hawa Bangura, who is unavoidably unable to participate in today's session as originally planned, owing to compelling countervailing events of a serious nature.

As a country that has been fully engaged in the process of post-conflict reconstruction over the past few years, Sierra Leone has gained keen insights into the challenges involved in formulating a comprehensive and sustainable peacebuilding strategy. We recognize, in particular, the urgent need for the international community to assess how best the current architecture, including the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), can be strengthened to ensure a successful transition from peacebuilding to sustainable security and development in countries emerging from conflict.

My delegation shares the ideas in many of the perceptive reflections outlined in the concept note prepared by Japan. Accordingly, I will endeavour to focus my intervention on the key questions highlighted therein and share with you my delegation's views concerning the lessons to be learned from Sierra Leone's own modest experience with post-conflict peacebuilding.

Over the past decade, Sierra Leone has served as a veritable field laboratory for the design and implementation of long-term peacebuilding strategies, as considerable international efforts have been expanded on addressing a vast array of challenges, initiatives and policy options during the country's transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding.

Today, Sierra Leone is on the threshold of the fifth anniversary of the Peacebuilding Commission's engagement in the country, having received catalytic funding through the Peacebuilding Fund to undertake critical peacebuilding efforts over this period.

Key among the challenges the United Nations and the international community have confronted during their engagement in Sierra Leone is the question of how best to devise comprehensive strategies and mechanisms to mobilize adequate support and resources designed to minimize the likelihood of a relapse.

Given the fragility of countries emerging from conflict, the challenges of building lasting peace can only be met with a comprehensive and integrated approach that goes beyond merely establishing political stability and security. In order for durable peace to be achieved, there must be a seamless linkage between those core goals and measures intended to lay a foundation for long-term development and democracy, particularly with respect to governance issues, social stability, human rights and the rule of law.

Unlike current peace operations, earlier efforts in conflict resolution were narrowly focused on crisis management, which allowed for gaps to emerge between the political and security spheres, on the one

hand, and reconstruction and development, on the other. That approach increased the likelihood that conflict countries would degenerate into renewed violence, in that it failed to adequately address the root causes of violent conflict, particularly the interplay between both underdevelopment and weak governance, on the one hand, and intra-state warfare, on the other.

In this regard, contemporary peace operations must focus on tackling the complexities of conflict situations by identifying and supporting structures that consolidate peace, not only during the peacebuilding phase, but also during the traditional peacekeeping period.

Following the Revolutionary United Front rebel barricade of some United Nations troops in the eastern part of Sierra Leone during the early stages of development, the role of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone was broadened to include emergency relief, disarmament and demobilization, the training of the military and police forces, human rights training, the repatriation of internally displaced persons and refugees, and the monitoring of elections. Building lasting peace also requires addressing the root causes of violent conflicts by strengthening Government institutions and enhancing political participation.

On the specific question of what measures can be implemented to achieve political stability, security and social stability in the framework of a comprehensive and integrated approach, I will endeavour to speak about some of the initiatives undertaken in the Sierra Leone and their impact on the overall peacebuilding process to date.

In the aftermath of the cessation of hostilities and the signing of the Lomé Peace Agreement, which paved the way for the successful conclusion of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, the Government, in collaboration with the United Nations and other bilateral and multilateral partners, embarked upon a comprehensive sector reform process involving the security and justice sectors.

The Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces, for example, were increased from 1,700 to 8,500, and underwent critical training and logistical support led by the International Military Advisory Team (IMAT), which was led by the United Kingdom. Sierra Leone has achieved a significant milestone — the deployment of military and civilian police peacekeepers in ongoing United Nations peace operations.

Similar interventions were undertaken with respect to the national police force, including critical training and logistical support and the rehabilitation and construction of police facilities throughout the country. In addition, the numerical strength of the force was increased from 5,000 to 9,000, with the aim of broadening and intensifying the Government's reach across the entire country for the maintenance of law and order and the enhancement of the respect for the rule of law.

Critical reforms were introduced through the Justice Sector Development Programme, resulting in the enhancement and development of the capacity of the judiciary to dispose of the existing backlog of cases.

All of the foregoing initiatives culminated in a comprehensive institutional reform process encompassing defence, police, intelligence, the judiciary and prisons, aimed at strengthening civilian oversight and democratic accountability of the security apparatus.

Undeniably, the security sector has come a long way in its development and Sierra Leone continues to progressively move towards the establishment of a coordinated security and intelligence architecture designed to allow a participatory approach to assume full ownership and responsibility for the security sector. The underlying principle has been: without security there can be no sustainable development.

The relational dimension of peacebuilding is critical to the attainment of lasting peace and social cohesion. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Special Court for Sierra Leone were established as instruments to achieve the twin goals of promoting reconciliation and forgiveness and combating impunity.

Adopting a strategy that includes comprehensive measures to protect and promote human rights, strengthen governance and rebuild democratic institutions will inevitably address many of the root causes of conflict. Accordingly, since the formal declaration of the end of the war in Sierra Leone in 2002, a broad array of initiatives within the security-political-humanitarian-development framework have been undertaken to enhance democracy and rebuild

weak or dysfunctional State institutions. All of these efforts have been geared towards laying the foundation for medium- and long-term national recovery, and have enhanced the State's capacity for effective delivery of public services to the citizenry and resulted in positive outcomes for human development.

To date, my Government has worked with the United Nations, in collaboration with our bilateral and multilateral partners, to restore State and local government institutions across the country, completing two presidential and parliamentary elections, as well as local government elections. In 2007, national elections saw the opposition dislodge the ruling party from power. I can say, with great pride, that, although not perfect, most of the strides being made in the ongoing democratization process in Sierra Leone are unparalleled in post-conflict situations in many parts of the world.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 as an advisory body and as a forum for mobilizing resources and support for the consolidation of peace in countries emerging from conflict, and its subsequent addition of Sierra Leone to its agenda, occasioned a turning point in our peacebuilding efforts. The considerable gains achieved from the engagement with Sierra Leone have clearly enhanced the importance of the Commission's role as a medium for securing resources and galvanizing support for peacebuilding initiatives that are comprehensive, coherent and coordinated and which reflect country-specific realities.

Since the engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission, Sierra Leone has made significant progress in the areas of governance issues, inter-party dialogue, the protection of human rights, and addressing the security threats posed by endemic corruption, drug trafficking and cross-border organized crime.

Security across the country has greatly improved thanks to the vigilance of joint police and military patrols. Several legislative enactments and a constitutional review process have been undertaken to address these and other factors that could potentially threaten the ongoing peacebuilding efforts and the long-term quest for national development, as envisioned within the framework of the Government's national strategy, known as the Agenda for Change.

While we continue to be indebted to the United Nations architecture currently engaged in Sierra Leone and to other development partners for the advances mentioned above, challenges still abound in addressing a number of development, human rights and governance issues. Perhaps most vexing of these concerns are the exceedingly high infant and maternal mortality rates, which are reportedly among the highest in the world, as well as burgeoning youth unemployment in my country. The fact is that, despite all of these efforts, coupled with the engagement of the international community, Sierra Leone remains close to the bottom of the human development index on many key indicators. This is a worrying concern for us.

This brings me to the nexus between security and development and the imperative of addressing the enormous economic and social challenges that beset post-conflict peacebuilding. It is in appreciation of this synergy that my Government has spared no effort in embarking upon a robust sector-wide reform regime, with a view not only to taking advantage of the multiplier effect, but, more important, to enabling us to invest in the development of infrastructure and public finance management. Similarly, we have resolutely pursued efforts to invest in the development of human capital for the furtherance of our social and economic recovery programme, a vital precondition for consolidating peace.

As I conclude my intervention, I wish to reiterate that as much as peacebuilding is a national imperative, there must be a holistic approach to conceiving and managing peacebuilding and preventive efforts, with local ownership, including through regional and subregional actors, playing a pivotal role.

However, it is important to note that, at this juncture, despite the overwhelming interest peacebuilding has generated in the past decade, mobilization of resources for peacebuilding and preventive efforts still remain grossly inadequate when compared to the corresponding commitments to peacekeeping. Of particular importance in this regard is the recognition of the catalytic role that can be played by a meaningful and sequential allocation of financial resources in the early stages of the transition period.

The issue of accessibility to funding for peacebuilding initiatives should be of particular concern as the major assisting nations and financial

institutions all continue to recover from the shocks of the current global financial crisis and economic slowdown, which has occasioned declining support and remittances from donors across the spectrum. Given this stark reality, the international community must urgently consider new approaches and methodologies for allocating and sustaining financing for peacebuilding and national post-conflict reconstruction.

The President: I now give the floor to Ms. Lucia Lobato, Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

Ms. Lobato (Timor-Leste): It is indeed an honour for me to represent my Government and my beloved country in this important debate and to present our Timorese experience in recovering from conflict over the past 10 years. I will keep my statement within the time limit, but I have circulated a more detailed text to representatives for the record.

As Minister of Justice, I am able to present a perspective on the development of peace through the legal institutions and the rule of law in my country. But I also wish to discuss some broader aspects of reconciliation, economic development, security and political stability, which are essential. I intend to focus more on the solutions we are providing to our problems than on the problems themselves. Let me share our experience.

This debate is particularly timely for us, as we have just hosted the Dili International Dialogue conference, which served as an opportunity to exchange experiences and find common ground among the so-called g7 Plus — the "small g seven plus" of fragile States. There was strong consensus among fragile countries and development partners to move from fragility to agility and seek greater and more focused engagement with development partners.

We have found that Timor-Leste has much to offer and to gain in the discussions about peacebuilding strategies. While eight years is but a short time since our national independence, we have made many achievements. We addressed some burning issues in the short term that were indeed critical to our recovery. Important social security measures were introduced, including recognition for the heroes of our nation who made sacrifices so that we could be free. Our relationship with Indonesia has been strengthened through initiatives such as the Truth and Friendship Commission and the ongoing dialogue between our leaders. Camps for internally displaced person were gradually and sensitively decommissioned and people were assisted in relocation and rebuilding. The Government intervened to ensure food security when rising rice prices threatened to limit supply.

The police and defence forces began to define their peacetime mandates and work together on joint operations when the internal security of the nation was threatened. The success of this was evident following the 2008 attacks on the Prime Minister and the President of the Republic. Thanks to sound leadership, this crisis inspired our security forces and provided a platform to pursue further security sector reform, greater professionalism and independence from political interference. The police are now adopting a community policing ethos, an approach by which the police serve and work together with the community to identify potential conflicts and to solve problems before they escalate to violence.

Timor-Leste is fortunate to be blessed with income from natural resources managed by the Petroleum Fund, a success story in transparency and good governance. Our Government believes that we need to invest the income we make back into our own country to improve the lives of our citizens. It is hard to explain the sense of keeping money in the bank while our people suffer. We need to create a dividend for peace and stability.

Yes, we have come a long way, but we have also learned many lessons, including some painful ones. We have learned that, without exception, countries can recover from conflict only if they can create a window of time in which they are free from further conflict. In Timor-Leste, we at last have that window, but we are not taking peace for granted. As our Prime Minister, Xanana Gusmão, has recently said,

> "It can be easy to breathe a sigh of relief when you begin to show signs of progress, when you achieve a level of apparent stability, because in times of peace we can forget the hardships of conflict".

We were not only emerging from a violent conflict; we were also, for the first time in our history, creating a new, independent State. In this spirit, I would like to share three observations on peacebuilding from our perspective, grounded in the recent history of Timor-Leste and enriched by pertinent themes from the Dili International Dialogue Conference.

In regard to the need for an inclusive political dialogue, in Timor-Leste we are aiming for a new maturity in political relations. Following independence, the Government set about addressing the roots of conflict. The world will remember that, at the birth of our new nation, our country lay in ruins. We were building our new country on a destroyed infrastructure, a limited economic sector and problematic social cohesion between ourselves and our neighbours. Our people had independence, but its benefits of it were as yet unfelt by many in their daily lives.

Not surprisingly, we faced conflict again in 2006. This conflict set back our development, but also presented valuable lessons. Our political actors learned that the way to our future was not through violence but through positive and active leadership, professionalism and commitment to development. From the 2006 conflict, we arose stronger as a nation, less afraid of expressing political differences, in a process enriching our political maturity without the need to revert to violent conflict. We confront each other every day, but we do so in our national Parliament. In addition, the parliamentary opposition is regularly included in public debates to forge a truly national consensus about issues of common interest to all Timorese, such as the package of major security laws that was approved last month.

As to setting the right national priorities within a flexible and long-term vision, in 2006 Prime Minister Xanana Gusmão and the fourth constitutional Government set about changing the course of Timor-Leste's future. Continued stability depends on our success not only in managing crises but also in forming respected State institutions that address all the needs of our society, from ensuring basic services to reducing poverty. In 2008, we realized that the only way to achieve sustainable development was to coordinate all our efforts. That same year, we presented a set of national priorities for the country.

Those priorities are consistent with the five areas identified as recurrent peacebuilding objectives in the Secretary-General's 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). In addition, we include a specific national priority area dedicated to access to justice and another to good governance and accountability, as well as one that deals with human resource development. A focus on youth and gender is mainstreamed into all our priority areas because we have a rapidly growing population which we want to be productive members of society, not alienated or frustrated over a lack of jobs.

We have reviewed our national priorities on an annual basis to ensure that we are adaptable to the changing situation. With the improvement in the security situation since 2008, we have been able to shift our priorities for 2010 to infrastructure and rural development. To provide an umbrella for this and prepare us for the long term, the Prime Minister is finalizing a strategic development plan for 2011-2030 that will ensure the coordination of all development activities in the country for the next 20 years.

Concerning justice and the rule of law, we know that one of the foundations of a stable and secure society operating within the rule of law is a respected justice system, whereby the rights and obligations of the State and its citizens are understood by citizens and are enforceable. We aim to give particular attention to the voices of vulnerable groups, especially women and children. Timor-Leste has also consistently prioritized the building of strong institutions of justice that complement the work done in policing and security sector reform. Justice cannot be neglected in our progress towards long-term security, peace and economic development.

A fortnight ago, the Council of Ministers endorsed a strategic plan for the justice sector, following a highly participatory process. This process informed and subsequently took account of the recommendations of the 2009 independent comprehensive needs assessment, facilitated by the United Nations. The justice sector strategic plan can be explained by its motto, "Bringing justice to the people", and in order to achieve that we have addressed five thematic areas, which are covered in more detail in the written version of this statement: institutional development; the completion of Timor-Leste's legal framework; the development of human resources; creating an infrastructure and applying information and communication technology; and providing access to justice.

We see justice as a fundamental part of this debate on peacebuilding and the prevention of conflict. Let me quote Pope John Paul II, in his address for the 2002 World Day of Peace, when he said that there is "no peace without justice, no justice without forgiveness". Forgiveness is not the opposite of justice. In fact, true peace is the work of justice. We are

working on a justice system that safeguards the rights of all citizens, including by providing legal remedies where their rights have been violated. We also acknowledge that there is no justice without forgiveness. While our country ensures the rule of law, we want to tell the Council that we suffered for many years, and in some cases the wounds are still fresh. We need to help heal these wounds, and we need to do so in our own way and in our own time.

As there is no peace without justice, there is also no peace without development. To conclude, I would like to share some important points.

Concerning the question of quality over expedience in capacity-building, in Timor-Leste we were criticized many years ago for choosing quality over expedience in preparing judicial actors, but we can now show results, and we encourage this principle to be applied as the only way of achieving confidence in State institutions.

On the alignment of all foreign development support to our development plans, in order to reach a lasting peace we still need support. Initiatives such as the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund could help us enormously. We highly appreciate the assistance of our development partners, including the United Nations Development Programme, all of which are now working with us as close associates rather than as far-away donors. We know that we are not alone. In order to achieve development, we cannot allow the existence of uncoordinated or competing implementation mechanisms. The only way to create confidence among our people and sustainable progress is to ensure that the development agenda is led by the Timorese leadership, taking the national dialogue to all parts of the country. Peacebuilding must be a genuinely national process if it is to be a productive element for stability and reconciliation. A process of national consultation led by the Prime Minister will begin in rural areas next month.

Concerning the adoption of modern, user-friendly technology, we need to automate Government services and make them more accessible to the public, more transparent and more accountable. Developing countries may at times be offered clumsy, outdated solutions, as we were in Timor-Leste, because people think we are not ready for modern technology. We do not agree with that thinking. We need to jump into the future. Recent advances in technology have resulted in systems that are more intuitive and easy to use, and we need to go straight to these solutions. Many of our people are already comfortable with technology, and we are working with our partners to ensure that they are trained to develop, support and adapt systems owned by Timor-Leste. In addition, we need to use environmentally friendly technology. Here, we can learn from the mistakes of our development partners. We can keep the beauty and the resources of our countries while advancing towards peace and stability.

With regard to strengthening the partnership between Government and civil society, the growth and progressive impact of our civil society organizations have demonstrated the engagement of the people of Timor-Leste. Timorese civil society has evolved from providing humanitarian support to representing the voices of the most vulnerable. It is inspiring to see more and more young people volunteer to serve their communities and join the fight for peace and justice.

To achieve peace, we must fight not conflict, but the causes that might lead us to conflict. While some States have taken centuries to build their State institutions and achieve social and economic development, we must do it in decades. As our Prime Minister has stated,

> "To unite an entire people who have been scarred from conflict in the struggle for peace is more difficult than to achieve unity in times of conflict. As we know, there are so many legitimate expectations from people who have fought for so many years for the ideals of freedom, equality and development that we can say that achieving true peace also means freeing people from poverty."

In Timor-Leste we believe that peacebuilding and development are not abstract words or theories, but as tangible and real as a hand to hold. My friends and colleagues in the Security Council took my country's hand when we reached out to them at the start of our journey and helped pull us out of war. Our famous Timorese spirit survives and grows, and I now offer our hand again and ask for theirs as true partners in development, so that we can walk together along the road to a lasting peace and a brighter future in Timor-Leste.

The President: I now give the floor to Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank.

Mrs. Okonjo-Iweala: I bring greetings to all present from the President of the World Bank, Bob Zoellick, who regrets that he could not be here today. I particularly want to thank you, Mr. President, for bringing us together to discuss this most important issue and for inviting the World Bank to contribute. I also wish to thank the Secretary-General for his strong leadership of the United Nations family on this issue.

As 2015 fast approaches, the world's attention is turning to progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The analysis that the World Bank has commissioned to inform its 2011 world development report on conflict and fragility confirms a disheartening fact — countries that are wracked by conflict and that suffer endemic fragility are not making the progress they need if the Millennium Development Goals are to become a reality for their people.

We are all aware of the desperate needs of these countries. Our research suggests that fragile States and those recovering from fragility account for only 37 per cent of population of developing countries if we exclude China, India and Russia. However, they account for 58 per cent of poverty in the developing world, as well as 67 per cent of infant deaths and 69 per cent of the deaths of children under five. Our analysis indicates that no fragile State has yet achieved a single Millennium Development Goal. By 2015, only 10 per cent of fragile States are expected to achieve the goal of halving poverty and hunger.

Against this backdrop, today's debate is a most timely one. These findings are a stark reminder of the enormous and complex challenges that lie ahead, but they are also a call to mobilize our combined resources on behalf of the poor and powerless.

Violent conflict is one of the most profound development challenges. Without peace and security, there can be no sustained development, as we have heard from our colleagues who spoke earlier. However, focusing on peacebuilding alone is not sufficient. Just as development cannot occur in the absence of peace, peace without development is a peace that may not last.

In recent years, the international community's discourse addressing violent conflict and its consequences has become more nuanced. We increasingly recognize that humanitarian action, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, State-building and development do not happen in a mechanical linear sequence, but are closely interlinked and overlapping. Such a complex landscape calls for cooperation and coherence among actors. It challenges us to address the short-term demands of a deeply damaged society while making sure that our actions do not compromise the longer-term goal of building an effective State.

Against this background, I would like to propose one overarching principle that must inform all that we do — results matter. By this, I mean that all that we do must contribute directly to results on the ground. Whether we are working in our headquarters offices to shape a new policy, engaging with a partner Government on a national development plan, or rebuilding a road for a war-ravaged community, we must constantly ask a single question: How will these actions provide people with a better life now and in the future?

The Government of Burundi clearly understands the importance of results. In 2006, with the support of the World Bank Institute, it introduced a rapid-results approach. This approach, which breaks down long-term development plans into manageable 100-day chunks, is now applied in 80 Government projects. A pilot project in the Ministry of Education resulted in the distribution of 250,000 textbooks to primary schools in 60 days, when previously this had required an entire school year. As part of a health care pilot project, 482 pregnant women visited health centres and were subject to HIV/AIDS screening in one month — far in excess of the previous monthly average of 71.

As we debate here on some of the best ways to get results, I would like us to focus on three crucial areas: country context, partnership and accountability. I believe that if we pay attention to these three areas, we will be able to contribute something substantial and enduring towards the immense challenges of helping countries create an environment of peace and security. Let me briefly elaborate on these three points.

First, it is about country context. Of course, we must learn from and build on our experience but, in the urgency of a post-conflict environment, it is often too tempting to simply apply a solution that worked elsewhere. We must guard against trying to replicate what we have done in the past without ensuring that it is appropriate to the present context. We must guard against any prescription that prevents adaptation and

flexibility. We need to do a better job of understanding the drivers of conflict and to understand the structure of elite incentives. We must also identify each country's fundamental strengths, comprehend the limits of its capacity to absorb change and act on what that knowledge tells us.

The World Bank-supported Justice for the Poor programme works to support the development of context-specific approaches to improving access to justice in South-East Asia, Africa and the Pacific. In Sierra Leone, the programme, along with other national and international efforts, is helping to scale up grassroots justice services. Trained community paralegals employ a combination of mediation, education and advocacy, and occasionally litigation, to seek redress for violations of rights. They engage both customary and formal institutions and provide a flexible, cost-effective method for delivering justice services that is tailored to Sierra Leone's particular socio-legal context. The Government is establishing a legal aid board, which will recognize and certify the paralegals, and it is expected that, within five years, about 100 community paralegals will serve all 154 chiefdoms in the country.

Our coordination efforts must be driven by our need to deliver meaningful results. I know that some see comfort in predictability — that our response in post-conflict situations would be improved by predetermining who does what. I must challenge that notion. While it is important that we recognize where our overall comparative advantage may lie, it is essential that our response should be determined by the dictates of the situation and our relative capacity to deliver in the particular context of the partner countries. Predetermination could easily result in inflexibility at a time when adaptability and nimbleness are most needed. Decisions must be delegated to where the best information is and be made at the lowest effective level. That means that we need to put our best people into the field, for it is our field staff who are best placed to decide, in consultation with their country partners, who should do what, when and how.

Secondly, partnerships are key. We must recognize that achieving a sustainable peace and setting in train a broad-based agenda for development are ultimately the work of a State and its citizens. We at the World Bank and in the development community need to be humble and to remind ourselves that we play a supporting role. We provide our resources, expertise and security assistance so that a people may be able to take back the reins of Government. The only credible coordinator of a State-building process is a legitimate sovereign Government. Our assistance must be shaped to support the country in mobilizing the human and material capacity that it has at its disposal to provide the services that its citizens need. That will mean many things for us. For example, we must pool our funding wherever possible to maximize coherence and reduce the burden on the Government, such as through multi-donor trust funds. We must support and work through the national budget and strengthen national fiduciary systems. We must use our comparative advantages and tailor our efforts to local needs and preferences, and we must reach agreement with our country partners on when it is appropriate to press for change and when we should stand back to allow a population to determine the need for reform.

Just as we need to strengthen our partnership with the countries that we seek to assist, we need to look too at our own partnerships. Are we working together effectively to achieve the results expected of us? The World Bank has recently appointed a senior envoy to Haiti, and a similar appointment to the Sudan is expected soon. Those will strengthen our partnerships in the field in countries in particular need. We are heartened by the support that we and the United Nations have received from the Swiss Government, which will enable us to exchange senior officers between the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office and the World Bank's Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Unit to help facilitate and deepen our complementary efforts.

My third point is that we are all accountable. While Governments must ultimately be accountable to their citizens for what they do, we must do everything that we can to reinforce that line of accountability. Running a parallel service delivery programme may give us results in the short term but it will not contribute to, and may even undermine, efforts to build the social compact that lies at the heart of a well-functioning State.

Shifting accountability also requires us to change the way that we monitor our efforts. We must get away from our traditional preoccupation with tracking inputs and focus our attention, and that of our partners, on achieving outcomes. Confronted by an uncoordinated and poorly performing health-care system, the Afghan Ministry of Public Health has established a basic

package of health services, delivered through community health workers and health centres. For the first time in many years, Afghans, particularly in rural areas, are seeing the delivery of valued health services made possible by a committed partnership between Government and local providers. Access for the people living in districts where the programme is being implemented has increased from 9 per cent in 2003 to over 80 per cent now. The most recent data for 2008 shows a fourfold increase in the number of outpatient visits to a level three times higher than in a neighbouring country. The programme has also seen a decrease in the under-five mortality rate from 257 per 1,000 in 2000 to 161 in 2007 to 2008.

In the spirit of mutual accountability, we too should be held accountable for what we deliver. For example, if we demand transparency in our partners, we should expect to provide it ourselves. In that regard, I am pleased to report that the World Bank has adopted a new Access to Information Policy that will open up the Bank's work even further, enhance public ownership of the development agenda, strengthen partnerships and encourage greater participation in Bank-supported operations.

So, as we turn to our deliberations today, I would ask us all to keep those three points in mind: the importance of the country context, true partnerships and appropriate accountability. I know that such ideas may sit uncomfortably with our limited appetite for risk and our need to demonstrate to our domestic constituencies the quick wins expected in an immediate post-conflict period. It is clear to me that addressing the challenges of development through such lenses will require fundamental changes to the way in which we do business.

Fortunately, the next few months will bring a number of opportunities to reshape and improve the way in which we do business. For example, the Secretary-General will report on progress since launching his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) last June, and, at the end of the year, the World Bank will present its World Development Report on the themes of conflict and fragility.

Let us make no mistake. If we are to deliver real results for the people living in fragile and conflict-affected situations, those areas deserve our full attention. We know that the costs of failure are great, but let us bear in mind that the benefits that flow from success can be even greater. Starting with our deliberations here today, let us take every opportunity to ensure that success.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Alkalaj (Bosnia and Herzegovina): At the outset, I would like to commend you, Minister Okada, for convening this meeting to discuss the topic of peacebuilding in post-conflict countries. I am confident that our deliberations today will significantly contribute to one of the most important items on the Security Council's agenda. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, as well as my colleagues, Foreign Ministers, for being here today, and we all anticipate valuable contributions. It is my honour to speak on behalf of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a country that has travelled the painful and difficult road from recipient of to active participant in United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts.

We recognize the importance of peacebuilding operations as a means of strengthening peace and security in the host country, thus contributing to creating conditions conducive to achieving sustainable and irreversible peace. In order to realize this goal, peacebuilding operations should be based on an integrated, coordinated and comprehensive approach to include the establishment of good governance, the rule of law, the promotion of human rights, institution-building, security sector reform, economic reconstruction and development. The right to return to pre-conflict homes and the full reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons through sustainable returns programmes must be an integral part of each and every peacebuilding strategy.

Peacebuilding activities require active interaction among all stakeholders, including the host country, donor countries, troop- and police-contributing countries, international financial institutions and the private sector. Furthermore, although we are of the view that all relevant national and international actors should be involved in the process of peacebuilding, we consider the political will of the host country and national ownership to be sine qua non conditions for the success of peacebuilding operations, given that the peacebuilding process is primarily the challenge and national responsibility of post-conflict countries.

In that regard, we believe that it is of the utmost importance to promote dialogue between the parties to a conflict, particularly among decision-makers and civil society organizations, in order to move the peacebuilding process forward and away from recurring conflict. Such a dialogue is critical to national institutions and capacity-building, as well as to confidence-building and the reconciliation process. Holding accountable all those who have committed crimes during a conflict and bringing them to justice is of equal importance to confidence-building and the reconciliation process, and hence could contribute significantly to the success of the social aspect of peacebuilding operations.

Organizing free, fair and transparent elections could be an important part of the process of creating political stability and establishing a democratic system, the main preconditions for reconciliation and reintegration processes, as well as for achieving sustainable and irreversible peace. Therefore, the utmost attention ought to be paid to their thorough preparation, including by facilitating the registration and full participation of voters, particularly internally displaced persons and refugees.

Bosnia and Herzegovina stresses that restructuring the security sector requires balance between international support and national ownership. Sustainable security involves strengthening institutions and processes, while a well-governed security sector is vital to overall peacebuilding and reconstruction efforts, as well as to development. Building a well-managed security sector that is sustainable requires not only police and military reform, but also impartial and accessible judicial and law enforcement sectors that must rely on transparency, equality, civilian protection, democratic norms and respect for human rights.

The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) of former combatants are indispensable elements of all peacebuilding operations. The availability of arms and alienated and dissatisfied former combatants represent a permanent risk of recurrence of conflict. Hence, DDR programmes should be a broader part of planning for development and reconstruction. Furthermore, in a situation where an early peace dividend is evident and generally accepted, the security sector is well managed and democratic norms are in place, there is also a window of opportunity for development in the true sense. Job creation measures, vocational education and retraining programmes for such vulnerable sectors such as returnees, youth, national minorities or demobilized combatants, as well as activities aimed at empowering women, should be in place. The role of women and their involvement in peacebuilding efforts should be strengthened in post-conflict societies.

Bosnia and Herzegovina emphasizes that peacebuilding strategies should be defined and owned by national stakeholders, with a clear implementation plan and benchmarks. In this context, the role of various agencies, funds and programmes should be defined and coordinated and best practices established. It is of key importance that external actors do not prescribe but advise, and this can be done only through a transparent and open process, with the assistance of the international community.

Political stability and security together, with social stability, will reduce the risk of recurring conflict only if it is integrated into a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy. Bosnia and Herzegovina welcomes the strengthened regional and international cooperation in addressing issues of drug-trafficking, organized crime, terrorism and trafficking in human beings. A coherent and integrated approach is essential not only in terms of combating these threats to peace and security, but also with regard to building reconciliation, coexistence, trust and stability at the regional level.

Finally, the road from an initial peace agreement to sustainable peace is long and winding. Travelling it requires an integrated and comprehensive approach, country-specific planning and strategy, as well as coherent implementation and the strong and steadfast commitment of both the host country and the international community. The peacebuilding initiatives that worked in Bosnia and Herzegovina were marked by synergy among multiple actors and, most important, between civilian and military endeavours.

I should like to conclude by saying that, in our work, we should focus more on preventive diplomacy and lessons learned in order to prevent conflicts, rather than dealing with post-conflict situations, which are always more costly in terms of human life and physical and economic destruction. On behalf of my country, I would like to reiterate our readiness to share the knowledge, experience and lessons learned regarding post-conflict peacebuilding in every situation where

our country's first-hand experience can be seen as relevant, reliable and useful.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are pleased to welcome you, Sir, to the presidency of the Security Council.

We have listened with interest to the statements made today. The difficult challenge to Governments in post-conflict crisis situations requires the development of balanced strategies to resolve them, based on the interrelationship between the issues of security, socio-economic development and the protection of human rights. We need a comprehensive approach that enables the achievement of sustainable peace and ensures that conflicts do not recur. There is no other alternative. There is no doubt, however, that peacebuilding activities must be based on the principles of national responsibility for identifying the priorities and approaches to implementing the strategy.

Assistance in any form from the international community should be extended with the agreement of national Governments and in respect for the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity. Ultimately, the specific characteristics of each country must be taken into account.

In successful post-conflict peacebuilding, it is very important to strengthen national institutional capacities. The United Nations undoubtedly plays a special role in coordinating international efforts in post-conflict socio-economic development. We understand very well that such activity presents many difficulties and that the United Nations Secretariat, programmes and funds, Member States, regional organizations and international financial institutions must be involved. In that respect, we support the Secretary-General's resolve to improve the Organization's effectiveness in post-conflict response, to strengthen the Secretariat's organizational mechanisms and to coordinate its work.

Many early peacebuilding tasks — such as security sector reform, disarmament and demobilization — are currently undertaken by United Nations peacekeeping operations. In assuming the main task of facilitating peace processes, United Nations peacekeepers play a critically important role in establishing conditions conducive to more comprehensive peacebuilding. We must bear in mind that peacebuilding is a long-term and multifaceted process that extends far beyond the framework of peacekeeping operations. In the light of the increasingly complex and multifaceted nature of peacekeeping mandates, it would be desirable for peacekeepers to be assigned only the primary task of peacekeeping.

We should draw upon the Peacebuilding Commission, regional organizations, the international financial institutions and donors and involve them in post-conflict peacebuilding. Here, we consider that the Peacebuilding Commission should focus on coordination, especially in areas that need particular attention in a post-conflict context. Its work should be complemented by mechanisms for cooperation with national Governments. We trust that the ongoing review of the Peacebuilding Commission will facilitate strengthening its coordinating role.

We support measures for enhancing strategic coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank, which is an important partner for the Organization in the peacebuilding sphere. We attach importance to the Peacebuilding Fund as an emergency financing mechanism in support of long-term peacebuilding mechanisms.

Peacebuilding requires close cooperation among the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We consider that the draft presidential statement prepared by the Japanese delegation will facilitate the strengthening of that kind of partnership, and we support its adoption.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): Mr. President, we are honoured by your presence today. It is also an honour to welcome Ministers from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, as well as the Managing Director of the World Bank.

I would like to thank the Japanese presidency for having organized this thematic debate and for having prepared the draft presidential statement that we will adopt later today. We fully support it.

This debate comes at a very timely moment, as we engage in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission and move forward in the implementation of the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding and early recovery (S/2009/304).

The peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations aims at integrating political stability, security and socio-economic development. That integrated

approach is a solid foundation for our work. However, while this premise is well established in our discourse, it still needs to be made fully operational in our practice.

We are learning by doing. In the work of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, which I have the honour to chair, the need for an integrated approach to simultaneously tackle those three dimensions of peacebuilding is evident. In order to surmount the recurrent political instability in that country, security sector reform stands as a matter of utmost priority, alongside the strengthening of State institutions. At the same time, efforts to revitalize the economy are indispensable: at the end of the day, they will ensure the much needed jobs to allow for stability to take hold and the fiscal revenues that will enable the State to function in an autonomous manner and provide basic services to the population.

We welcome Foreign Minister Okada's proposal that, in peacebuilding strategies, high priority be attached to the creation of youth employment.

Another sine qua non condition for effective peacebuilding is the notion of national ownership. In a country emerging from conflict, however, ensuring national ownership can be particularly challenging. On the one hand, it is essential for the State to take the lead in the peacebuilding process; on the other, capacity constraints usually get in the way, making it necessary to build institutional capacity as the process moves forward. In that regard, we welcome ongoing efforts aimed at establishing pools of civilian capacity to be expeditiously deployed on the ground. Needless to say, such pools should not replace existing local capacity, ought to resort to experts from developing countries as much as possible, especially from the region of the country concerned, and must help to develop national capacity in post-conflict countries.

Our collective experience in peacebuilding suggests that such efforts must not only be undertaken simultaneously in different domains, but must also start very early in the post-conflict process. There is an emerging consensus that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are not sequential forms of engagement, but rather a continuum. In this regard, we welcome the potential contribution of the Peacebuilding Commission to countries in early recovery and encourage greater coordination between the Security Council and the Commission. The potential role the Commission can play in early post-conflict situations should be explored more actively, especially with regard to the linkages between security and socio-economic development.

Peacebuilding is a collective and multidimensional effort. Adequate coordination is therefore central to effective peacebuilding, but it remains a formidable challenge. The first task is to share information among actors on the ground concerning the activities that are being undertaken. Such information-sharing should lead to a distribution of labour to ensure coherence in plans and actions, both in the field and at Headquarters. This is, of course, easier said than done. The challenge is to persuade donors and partners to participate in a coordinating exercise under the leadership of the country concerned and to align their assistance to national priorities. Overcoming this challenge will greatly enhance the effectiveness of our individual and joint endeavours in peacebuilding, to the benefit of post-conflict countries.

Another important aspect of peacebuilding efforts has to do with developing strategic partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, in the light of the inherent regional nature of many situations that need to be addressed. Engagement with international financial institutions is also very important, given the mutually reinforcing role of the activities of those institutions and of those related to peacebuilding. Greater involvement of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in peacebuilding and their growing partnership with the United Nations system are most welcome.

Peacebuilding efforts will not bear fruit if they are not supported by effective financing mechanisms. It is imperative to envision funding arrangements capable of channelling substantial resources in a timely manner. We welcome the role played by the Peacebuilding Fund in providing catalytic support to post-conflict countries, which must be complemented by other sources of longer-term financing. In this regard, we believe the activities of the Fund can benefit from greater synergy with the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

We look forward to the results of the ongoing review of the Commission. The review process has been an excellent opportunity to take stock of the

progress achieved thus far and discuss ways to improve the Commission's work. We hope it can lead to a Commission that is placed at the centre of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, endowed with a strong secretariat, capable of garnering all the available expertise within and outside the United Nations system, able to foster coordination among various actors and flexible enough to deal with the manifold challenges related to peacebuilding processes.

To some extent, peacebuilding is a new frontier for the multilateral system, as we still have to set up or improve institutional arrangements, establish adequate procedures and create political constituencies around the globe. Formative periods can be challenging, but they are also promising. We are at this precise moment in peacebuilding. The single most important factor to determine our success will be our ability to effectively integrate stability, security and development into coherent actions adjusted to the concrete needs of each situation. This is no small challenge, but it is one that is worth embarking on.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to express its profound appreciation to the delegation of Japan for convening this timely debate on the important theme of post-conflict peacebuilding. We are also honoured by the presence here today of ministers from Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

Mr. President, your choice of theme has provided an opportunity for the Security Council to contribute to the series of events targeting the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) five years after its establishment. We believe that the outcome of this debate can make an important contribution to the mandated review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The year 2010 is a pivotal one for peacebuilding. First, the African Union has declared 2010 the Year of Peace and Security in Africa. Secondly, the World Bank's *World Development Report 2010* will focus on the issues of conflict and fragility. It is also the year that the Secretary-General will issue his first progress report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. These activities, combined with the Council's previous discussions on this subject, will, we hope, underline the importance of peacebuilding as an integral pillar of peace and security.

I would like to highlight five main points in this debate. First, national capacity and ownership are vital to ensuring lasting peace. We stressed this point a few days ago in the context of the presence of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in that country and ardently believe in its applicability to other countries emerging from conflict. Ensuring ownership on the basis of capacity is a challenge that we all recognize and should strive to meet.

Although peacekeepers are often called upon to support this effort, their role is essentially a gap-filling measure. It is important, therefore, for national Governments and other actors in peacebuilding to better understand the very thin line between peacekeeping and peacebuilding responsibilities.

Secondly, a comprehensive approach to peacebuilding requires partnership, consistency and coherence among the various actors. For a partnership to be strong and effective, it must be grounded in a shared vision and common objective. As Member States engaged in peacebuilding, we need to be consistent and coherent in the policies that we promote and, indeed, speak with one voice on this issue, regardless of the setting and place of discussion.

Nowhere is there greater need for this approach than in the interactions between the United Nations, World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization aimed at enhancing the goals of peace, security and development in the aftermath of conflict. In our opinion, our shared vision of and common objective for peacebuilding should guide the various programmatic activities and enable the different actors to adapt and respond to emerging challenges, notwithstanding their operational mandates and reporting lines.

Thirdly, threats to peace have cross-border implications and linkages, often demanding broader efforts and mechanisms at the regional and subregional levels. This is not only true of conflicts in West Africa, but is the case in most regions of the world. For this reason, we would like to emphasize the need to pay due attention to the regional dimensions of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding cannot be achieved using a short-term strategy. It requires a comprehensive and integrated strategy responsive to needs and priorities, as well as the long-term commitment of all actors at the national, regional and international levels.

Fourthly, the PBC should have a central role in sustaining a monitoring commitment to peacebuilding activities. Monitoring for its own sake will be of little use if it does not seek to focus attention on an end-state. Consequently, the PBC should aim to keep international focus on the end goals of peacebuilding. The PBC is not an abstract entity. In essence, it is made up of member States with a political will. As such, we should demonstrate through our words and our deeds that we truly own and cherish the institution. Its strength or weakness will be measured in large part by the quality of our political commitment to the institution and its cause.

I believe that we should seize the moment in 2010 following the PBC review to regenerate momentum around peacebuilding. We would also need to alert our individual Governments to the need to invest in peacebuilding if we are to help countries emerging from conflict to sustain their peace. The review should help us reinvigorate the vision of 2005 on the basis of the experience gained from engaging countries on the PBC's agenda.

Lastly, if the PBC is to serve its intended purpose, it will require substantive support, expertise and institutional linkages within the United Nations system and beyond. Strengthening the capacity and role of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) should be the first step in the direction of positioning the Office to provide such support and build such linkages. The PBSO could also assist the PBC in promoting partnerships for peacebuilding.

Let me conclude by reiterating our support for the delegation of Japan's initiative to convene this debate and the critical importance of feeding its outcome into the PBC review. We support the draft presidential statement to be adopted at the end of today's debate.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank His Excellency Mr. Okada, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, for being here with us today, and Japan for having organized this open debate on the wide-ranging subject of peacebuilding. I also thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank for their presence and statements this morning.

France associates itself with the statement to be made by the representative of the European Union.

The United Nations is devoting all its political, military, humanitarian and development instruments to developing an effective strategy to prevent countries that have been weakened by war from reverting to conflict.

First of all, peacebuilding strategies should be defined on the ground in cooperation with local authorities. National ownership is an essential aspect of their success. As emphasized by the Secretary-General in his report of June 2009 (S/2009/304), these efforts should be based on the efforts of the countries involved, taking into account local, national and international capacities available.

The London Conference on Afghanistan in January thus restated the international community's long-term commitment to the Afghan people and authorities on the basis of a road map to accelerate their assumption of sovereign responsibility.

The establishment of lasting peace in a country emerging from conflict involves greater consistency in strategies and the participation of all peacebuilding actors, including United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, non-governmental organizations, national Governments or civil society organizations.

However, the coordination role falls first and foremost to the Peacebuilding Commission, which we created five years ago. This subsidiary advisory body should ensure that actors and resources can be better coordinated. Today, we must note that the outcomes achieved in this regard could and should be improved, and that will be the challenge of the review process that we have initiated.

Indeed, the United Nations peacebuilding architecture should be able to respond to the realities on the ground and to meet the expectations of Member States by setting out the priorities areas to be dealt with by all of the actors on the ground. The Peacebuilding Commission should become this central, recognized element that we all hope for, both in New York and on the ground, and both within the United Nations and in the international community as a whole.

The Peacebuilding Fund, which was established in parallel with the Commission, could play a catalysing role by mobilizing bilateral and multilateral donors. However, we must meet not only immediate

needs but also more long-term ones, and that is one of the main difficulties that faces us in terms of peacebuilding. We must be able to simultaneously anticipate, act and develop our strategies in order to ensure that countries do not relapse into conflict.

Beyond the cases that the Commission has before it, we can work on improving coordination between all the actors within the United Nations family, particularly in countries where peacekeeping operations or special political missions are deployed. This is the case with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for instance. New, custom-made tools, such as integrated strategic frameworks, enable us to better coordinate the efforts of all actors for the benefit of the countries where peacebuilding remains necessary.

To conclude, I would like to recall that peacebuilding does not necessarily depend on an official emergence from conflict. The unfortunate example of Timor-Leste has revealed that drawing down a peacekeeping operation too rapidly and not managing the transition process carefully enough can lead to a resumption of conflict. In order for durable strategies that are applicable in the immediate and long term to be implemented, peacebuilding should be clearly understood as one dimension of peacekeeping and not just as the step that follows it.

The Council debate that France organized on 12 February 2010 highlighted the importance of including the peacebuilding dimension from the outset of a peacekeeping operation. Stepping up relations between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council might also bring about a strengthening of the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The Commission review process will make it possible to enhance the Commission's efforts and furnish the United Nations with a truly effective tool to ensure that countries do not relapse into conflict.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): Let me begin by thanking you, Foreign Minister Okada, and the delegation of Japan for organizing this high-level debate on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. I also thank the Secretary-General, the honourable ministers of Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank for their statements. We also welcome the participation of the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This debate, which is taking place during the review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, is both useful and timely. The United Nations, regional and subregional organizations and the wider international community continue to be preoccupied, and rightly so, with issues of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Uganda underscore the importance of developing comprehensive peacebuilding strategies so that countries emerging from conflict are supported in their move towards sustainable peace, economic recovery and development. This comprehensive approach is essential if post-conflict countries are to avoid a relapse after peacekeeping operations. For peacebuilding strategies to be successful, they must be designed to address a particular conflict situation. We can never have a one-size-fits-all approach, although broad parameters for most conflict situations have been identified.

What is critical is that a comprehensive strategy should, first, be nationally owned; secondly, address the root causes of the conflict; thirdly, leverage national, regional and international resources to support in a coordinated way the implementation of identified peacebuilding priorities; and fourthly, address the provision of peace dividends, including basic services.

Our experience in Uganda has shown us the importance of identifying national priorities based on the country's unique situation and conditions.

One of the lessons we learned is that it is important to prioritize and sequence peacebuilding activities, starting with the most urgent and critical elements, including security sector reform, reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction. To ensure sustainability, building and strengthening national institutions and developing local capacity are key prerequisites.

Peacebuilding is a collective endeavour and a shared responsibility, in which national authorities, regional and subregional organizations, the United Nations and the wider international community have important roles to play. The need for mobilization of adequate, flexible and timely funding for peacebuilding activities does not need to be emphasized again. We therefore welcome the ongoing strengthening of strategic partnerships between the United Nations, the World Bank and other financial institutions.

In conclusion, we reiterate the need to ensure that peacebuilding activities are considered at an early stage in conflict situations and that all actors work within a well-coordinated and coherent framework. Uganda supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement on peacebuilding.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I would like to welcome you, Mr. President, to the Security Council today and to thank you, both for presiding over this important debate today and for the excellent contribution that Japan's delegation makes to the Council's work. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the ministerial and other participants today for sharing their particular insights. It has been especially valuable to hear the perspectives of countries taking important steps on the long and challenging path to rebuilding themselves.

Peacebuilding is at the heart of this Council's work. In some senses, everything we do in this Council is about building peace. We give it different labels, depending on the specific task at hand. But conflict prevention and peacekeeping are all part of this broader goal of sustainable peacebuilding, and it tests every resource — political, security and development — that the United Nations can deploy. As the minister from Sierra Leone said earlier today, we need to look at the rebalancing of resources between conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping. The ultimate goal for us should be to strengthen the capacities of countries emerging from conflict to drive forward their own recovery processes and address the very difficult governance, security and development challenges they face.

As we discussed in the Council debate in January under the French presidency, the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding is not a linear one. Countries at risk of relapsing into conflict need to be able to provide sufficient security and access to justice, and be able to resolve conflicts peacefully to allow for the departure of peacekeeping troops. International support for that process is not just about offering barracks and boots. Integrating combatants who were previously fighting each other in a new army, ensuring the discipline of that new army and then putting it under proper civilian oversight can be daunting tasks for a new Government overseeing a fragile peace process.

Those elements alone are insufficient. Successful peacebuilding needs real progress on providing basic services and economic recovery. That must start as soon as possible after a peace agreement is reached. Delivering that requires leadership and vision from within the country itself. The United Nations, and in particular the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, has a key role in bringing the United Nations system and the wider international community systems — political, security and development efforts — behind a common nationally owned strategy.

So how can the United Nations and the broader international community deliver more effectively? In the coming months, I believe, we should focus on three issues. First, we need to improve the speed and quality of deployable civilian experts to help build national capacities. As the Secretary-General said earlier today, the recently launched review of civilian capacities needs to generate practical solutions.

Secondly, we need greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities within the United Nations and a strengthened partnership with the World Bank. That will allow us to make the right investments in order to achieve more timely and predictable responses in such areas as support for re-establishing the basic functions of a State.

The conclusions of both those strands of work need to be included in the Secretary-General's follow-up report on peacebuilding. That report should include a frank assessment of what is, and what is not, working on the ground.

Thirdly, we need a Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) that has real impact on the ground. The PBC's focus should be on helping countries to address the barriers to peacebuilding and on getting clear commitments from Governments and the international community about what needs to be done in a defined period of time to help achieve that. And we need the PBC to have a much more distinctive voice when providing advice. The Council should have an opportunity to listen to that advice when discussing peacebuilding and peacekeeping issues. The PBC review provides an opportunity for us to establish that practice.

The Council was due to visit the Democratic Republic of the Congo this weekend. Unfortunately, that has had to be postponed for climactic reasons. But

we hope we will be able to reinstate that visit soon. We think that the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be a real test of the international community's ability to move from a primarily peacekeeping presence to a broader peacebuilding role. That will require the United Nations system, the international financial institutions and the wider international community to play a more significant role in helping to restore a State and to support it in addressing critical peacebuilding needs.

History is littered with collapsed or faltered peace processes, some of which are due to underlying governance and rule of law issues not being addressed. When such threats emerge, the Council needs to be able to react rapidly to prevent further deterioration. The United Kingdom supports the draft presidential statement that is before the Council.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): First of all, I wish to welcome you, Sir, and to commend Japan's presidency for organizing this meeting. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the Managing Director of World Bank for their substantive briefings, which included valuable assessments and recommendations on how to develop post-conflict peacebuilding processes. We are particularly honoured by the presence of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well that of the Ministers of Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste.

The concept note provided by Japan (S/2010/167) includes pertinent questions that encompass a wide range of issues on the peacebuilding agenda. It also provides food for thought for future discussion. In that respect, I shall today limit my intervention to four points that we deem to be of particular importance. Moreover, the draft presidential statement that is before us includes a number of measures relevant to post-conflict peacebuilding. We fully support it.

The challenges we are addressing today are not new. For over a decade, we have grappled with how to bring peacebuilding upstream and how to mount a more rapid and effective response in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. Although the challenges aggravated by global resource constraints remain formidable, the renewed enthusiasm on the part of Member States and the international community, as well as the impetus gained so far through the reform of United Nations peace operations, have brought about added optimism for a new peacebuilding agenda.

In our view, the new peacebuilding agenda requires, first and foremost, recognition in practice, not just in rhetoric, of the substantive and inherent linkages between peace, security, stability, development, human rights and the rule of law. That, in turn, compels us to take complementary, integrated and properly sequenced actions in all those areas, so as to achieve a catalytic impact on the outcome of our peacebuilding endeavours.

Indeed, peacebuilding requires well-calibrated action, not only in various policy areas but also with regard to short-term, medium-term and long-term goals. That was also one of the messages of the Secretary-General's report last year (S/2009/304). We agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion that decisions taken in the short term should not prejudice medium- and long-term peacebuilding, but that they should be mutually reinforcing.

Recognizing the nexus between peace, security and development leads me to the second important element, which is the necessity of deciding upon a comprehensive strategy and a political-strategic compass that is designed to support viable peace processes and political, economic and social stability. In other words, that strategy should be an integrated one that merges the tools of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It should also be coherent, adapted to the needs of a situation and well-coordinated vis-à-vis the various actors involved in peacebuilding.

The lessons learned from various peacebuilding challenges reveal that, where such an integrated strategy is missing, the international peacebuilding agenda is bound to be ad hoc, piecemeal or even contradictory, if not outright counterproductive. In the Balkans, for example, the shared peacebuilding framework involving military, diplomatic, economic, legal and social instruments of the European Union, NATO, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations made collective and concerted action possible; whereas in some regional conflicts in Africa, the absence of such a framework at times hinders the success of the peacebuilding project, despite continuous international assistance and high volumes of aid.

This brings us to the third important element, which is ownership of the process. Undoubtedly, peacebuilding is ultimately a home-grown project and

the realization of its goals requires the active engagement of local stakeholders. This would not only avoid the criticism that it has been imposed on the national Government and population, but also would increase the chances of its success.

Therefore, any mechanism for building durable peace and justice must be applied with the active participation of all local stakeholders, including civil society, marginalized groups, ex-combatants, professional associations and women's organizations. This is particularly significant in terms of social reconciliation efforts, where grass-roots structures play a catalytic role.

At the regional level, neighbouring countries and regional factors should also be brought into the picture. Given that many conflicts have cross-border dimensions beyond the domestic political circumstances, the scope of conflict analysis and response has to be broadened, not only conceptually but also geographically. Of course, the concept of ownership will remain abstract, unless it is accompanied from the very beginning by capacity-building support on the part of the international community.

While the components of any peacebuilding strategy should be tailored to specific situations, the basic pillars on which the international community can lend its support remain more or less the same. Four important elements come to fore for the realization of sustainable peace in a post-conflict situation: restoration of a functioning State, i.e. ensuring basic safety, security and services; rebuilding the legitimacy of the State by ensuring the democratic accountability of political leaders to their citizens and strengthening the rule of law; promoting social reconciliation to heal the wounds of conflict; and revitalizing of the economy.

This leads me to my fourth point, namely, that the United Nations has a unique role to play here, one that could merge the State-centred and human-centred approaches in all these areas and coordinate the work of various stakeholders to deliver as one on the ground. The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique position allowing it to explicitly address the nexus between security and development, could play a critical role in this respect. Furthermore, the United Nations can also serve as a clearing house for financial, in-kind and technical support at the bilateral and multilateral levels, where all the stakeholders could interact with each other on their individual projects and programmes. The Security Council also has an important role to play in signalling strong international attention and support for the peace process and for the initiation of peacebuilding.

I would like to conclude my remarks by emphasizing that the new peacebuilding agenda highlights the need to operate at many levels, from the micro community to the macro political level, from the national and regional levels to the global level. This is why we should go beyond State-centric concepts of security and move to multi-faceted and multi-level strategies that can help address the multiple causes of conflict from a long-term developmental perspective.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Like other delegations, I would like to begin by welcoming your presence here, Mr. President, and express our gratitude for your country's initiative in organizing this open debate on a subject that is of utmost importance to this Organization, namely, peacebuilding and, particularly, in adopting a comprehensive global and strategic approach. I would also like to greet and thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Ministers Zalmai Rassoul, Alfred Palo Conteh, Lucia Maria Lobato and Dr. Okonjo-Iweala for their illuminating statements and thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia Herzegovina for his presence.

Today's session affords us a fine opportunity to consider the importance of avoiding relapses into conflict in post-conflict situations. We firmly believe in post-conflict prevention and reconstruction and in the importance of strengthening the link between security and development in the transition to peace from a conflict situation, taking into account the key elements established by the countries themselves. A positive advance in this regard, is the recognition by the Security Council that it is necessary to incorporate coherence and integration into the establishment of peace, peacekeeping and peacebuilding and development in order to ensure a prompt and efficient response to post-conflict situations and avoid a relapse. We support peacebuilding measures that will be incorporated in a timely fashion in the mandates of peacekeeping operations.

The peaceful settlement of a conflict does not, in itself, guarantee that the risk of a resumption of violence will be eliminated. It is essential to establish

the necessary conditions to guarantee lasting stability and security. It is as important to initiate peace, as it is to maintain it and ensure that it is sustainable.

Security sector reform is an important priority, since it allows for the prevention of new outbursts of instability and relapses in violent conflicts and makes it possible to strengthen the human rights framework, which, in turn, contributes to economic and social development. For my country, peace and justice are inextricably linked in an integral solution to conflict. Therefore, no crime should go unpunished, and mechanisms should be established to investigate and clarify possible violations of international law by any of the parties involved in conflicts. This is an essential component in achieving national reconciliation and durable peace.

Security and justice, however, should be built on a political foundation. We recognize that the holding of elections is an important aspect of conflict prevention, peacebuilding and establishing permanent peace. This certainty has been reflected in our participation in Lebanon, Timor-Leste, Haiti, Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina, with an effort to back the efforts of the Governments of these countries to strengthen their electoral institutions. If we fail to acknowledge that the structural factors of a conflict, such as poverty, social and economic inequality, are severe obstacles to achieving sustainable development, then we loose sight of important tools for achieving lasting peace, eliminating poverty and promoting development and equal opportunity. It is also necessary to incorporate into early action attention to basic needs, such as housing, education, health, food and jobs as part of the tools of peacebuilding.

We consider it essential that all these aspects be based on the understanding that the primary responsibility pertains to the country involved. Therefore, it is important that any strategy be aligned with the national priorities of each country. The international community has a crucial role to play in the first post-conflict stages, but it is necessary that the application of these principles be adapted to the existing realities in each case, in particular, the political, economic, institutional, social and cultural conditions that prevail in the country in question.

We have frequently underscored the importance of establishing national peacebuilding strategies formulated through a broad-based advisory process involving all national, regional and international stakeholders, both within and outside the United Nations system, including donor countries and financial organizations, in order to ensure greater consistency in peacebuilding efforts.

However, the coordinated implementation of these efforts has been somewhat neglected, despite its great importance in guaranteeing a lasting peace. In this context, a body like the Peacebuilding Commission has enormous potential. With a view to contributing to these matters, my delegation, together with our colleagues from Ireland and South Africa, will facilitate the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission — an exercise which we hope will have a positive impact on peacebuilding processes.

In conclusion, I express the support of my delegation for the draft presidential statement that we will adopt at the end of this meeting.

Mr. Salam (Lebanon): At the outset, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this open debate, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan for having honoured us with his presence. I should also like to join my colleagues in welcoming the Ministers from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and the Managing Director of the World Bank. I should also to thank the Secretary-General for his insightful remarks.

After 15 years and a dozen major operations, peacebuilding remains a vast, complex and only partially successful experiment. Important lessons have been learned along the way, yet there is still much that we need to learn about building the conditions for a durable peace in war-torn States.

A commonly agreed upon element of peacebuilding is the need for a coordinated and integrated strategy that defines critical peacebuilding priorities. Such strategies should be forged at the country level through dialogue with national actors. The alignment of action and the resources behind it is critical to successful peacebuilding. Due to the increased complexity of post-conflict reconstruction processes, it is fundamental that this strategy be flexible and subject to timely review according to evolving peacebuilding priorities and developments on the ground.

Perhaps the most common criticism of peacebuilding to date has been that international

agencies are not sufficiently sensitive to the unique characteristics of each host country. Indeed, a particular institutional solution or sequence of events is not necessarily appropriate in one country simply because it has been used with relative success in another conflict-affected country. Countries have unique histories and traditions of social organization, which create different challenges and opportunities for conflict resolution. Therefore, it is not possible to develop a generic blueprint for peacebuilding engagement. Such engagement should be context-sensitive and address the underlying causes of the conflict.

The main objectives of peacebuilding are establishing security, building confidence in a political process, expanding core national capacity and achieving socio-economic development, as we all know. It is important, however, to identify the activities which best contribute to achieving these objectives according to the country-specific situation and its actual needs. Since these objectives are interdependent and mutually reinforcing, it is of fundamental importance that the peacebuilding framework be clearly articulated and ensure coherence among the objectives, whether at the level of planning or of implementation.

Ensuring security and preventing new eruptions of violence are the foremost goals of any peacebuilding process. Without the reasonable assurance of physical security for the bulk of the population, there is little hope of achieving progress on institution-building, inter-community reconciliation, reconstruction or development. Therefore, security sector reform is essential and should be nationally owned from the outset. Effective security sector reform requires effective disarmament; the creation of security forces that are well trained, disciplined and politically neutral; and a security sector that is under the civilian oversight of a democratic Government.

A basic level of political will and commitment on the part of national actors is a precondition for peacebuilding. Political issues that remain unaddressed or only partially addressed by peace agreements may call, after such an agreement is signed, for sustained mediation efforts as part of a coherent approach to peacebuilding. Successful peacebuilding efforts require the promotion of a participatory process of healing and reconciliation through inclusive dialogue.

Initiating change in the political culture of a society is one of the most difficult aspects of any post-conflict transition. It requires long-term strategies involving large segments of society and could include extensive education, sensitivity campaigns and consensus-building within society. These more intangible aspects of peacebuilding are frequently overlooked in favour of more technical rebuilding and assistance. Nonetheless, they are essential to long-term change. The people must be at the heart of any search for solutions to conflict and efforts to consolidate peace.

A poor governance framework will undermine the sustainability of peace. Thus, it is essential that the peacebuilding process advance and support the establishment of democratic, transparent and accountable governance and the reconstruction of well-functioning State institutions. The delivery of early peace dividends includes the provision of basic services. Countries in conflict often experience a serious deterioration in or even the complete destruction of their systems of governance, service delivery and economic production. Successful peacebuilding requires helping societies to reverse these trends.

Peacebuilding also requires coherent responses to the needs of vulnerable people through programmes and services to reintegrate repatriated refugees and ex-combatants into civil society, to resettle internally displaced persons and to assist war-affected populations in general. Women, in particular, are key to peacebuilding. Their full participation in the peacebuilding process, both as victims of conflict and as important drivers of recovery and development, is essential.

But how do we ensure that peacebuilding efforts are perceived as legitimate in the eyes of those they are trying to help? The answer is to maximize local ownership by involving populations as quickly and extensively as possible in their own governance. National actors are the engines and the drivers of the peacebuilding process. They are able to identify the most pressing needs of their society and the most effective means of addressing them. Hence, national authorities must take primary responsibility for re-establishing the key institutions of security, governance and economic recovery, with the support of the United Nations and international partners.

Since the greatest resources for a durable peace are always rooted in the local people and their culture, this peace should be built from the bottom up by enhancing sustainable citizen-based peacebuilding initiatives and by opening up public political spaces in order to allow institutions of civil society to flourish. To this end, peacebuilding efforts should promote initiatives that incorporate citizen-based activities, including community peace projects and other grassroots initiatives, in order to empower civil society and to deepen its capacity for non-violent social change.

Financial resources are, of course, essential prerequisites without which effective leadership, common strategies and more predictable support capacity remain only theoretical paradigms.

Finally, when large-scale violence ends, the challenges facing the leadership and people of a country are enormous, and peace is often very fragile. International support in such complex and rapidly evolving situations is of fundamental importance and requires Member States and international organizations to align their assistance and engagement in support of an early and prioritized peacebuilding framework in a flexible and predictable manner.

Civil wars, by definition, are fought primarily within the boundaries of a single State, but they are rarely isolated from political and economic dynamics in the surrounding region. Violence in one country is often part of a larger, regional constellation of conflict. Hence, the importance of cooperation with regional organizations, given the transnational nature of many peacebuilding challenges. The Peacebuilding Commission is the main United Nations platform for international engagement in post-conflict countries; we look forward to this year's review, which will provide an opportunity to improve the Commission's effectiveness in fulfilling its mandate and enhancing its relationship with the Council.

Lebanon supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement on peacebuilding.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (Austria): My delegation is grateful to Japan for having organized this important debate under the presidency of Foreign Minister Okada. We are also grateful for the presence and statements of the Secretary-General, the Foreign Ministers of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

Austria associates itself with the statements to be delivered by the representatives of the European Union and the Human Security Network later in this meeting.

How to make the best possible use of the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict is not only the critical challenge for countries emerging from conflict, but also a critical challenge for the international community at large. It is crucial to long-term peace and stability and the realization of early peace dividends. Decisive action aimed at achieving durable peace and long-term sustainable development must be undertaken from the earliest stages onwards and go hand in hand with the possible deployment of integrated peacekeeping missions.

In order for peacebuilding measures to prove successful, generating national ownership must be at the centre of all efforts. Peacebuilding activities should therefore draw on existing national capacities while at the same time assisting the development of effective civilian capacities, including the identification of opportunities and capacity-building for local private sector engagement. A stronger involvement of the local private sector should also be considered in the context of procurement activities for peacekeeping operations. This would support the provision of social stability through economic opportunity, thus contributing to the irreversibility of the peacebuilding process.

Key priorities in the immediate aftermath of conflict include the protection of human rights, the re-establishment of the rule of law, the inclusive implementation of peace processes, the reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration — including of children associated with armed groups — as well as security sector reform. The establishment and support of effective and independent justice and reconciliation mechanisms is a precondition for ensuring accountability for past abuses. They will contribute to justice and long-term peace, as well as to the reconciliation of war-torn societies, thereby minimizing the risk of future outbreaks of violence.

We are convinced that peacebuilding can be successful only if all sectors of society are included. In accordance with Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), all activities in the field of peacebuilding must be mindful of the vital role women

play in re-establishing post-conflict societies. In this regard, I also fully support what was just said by my Lebanese colleague. The specific needs of women must be reflected in peace agreements and their involvement in participation in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies assured. This should be complemented by the allegation of gender-specific funds.

Civil society should play a greater role in the early stages of peacebuilding. We will focus on new concepts of cooperation between military and civilian actors at the forthcoming 3C Conference to be held in Vienna on 5 and 6 May. Enhanced coordination at the national, regional and international levels, as well as ensuring mutual accountability, are prerequisites for avoiding duplication and ensuring efficiency. To secure the success of our engagement, we must coordinate with all partners having a comparative advantage on the ground. Cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, such as the European Union and the African Union, as well as with the international financial institutions, must be intensified.

Austria acknowledges the crucial role of the Peacebuilding Commission in addressing a country's post-conflict needs. The experiences of countries on its agenda underline the necessity of involving the Commission from the outset. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding must be considered in a coherent and parallel manner rather than sequentially. In this context we welcome the fact, for instance, that the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste, which is a peacekeeping operation, is already integrating peacebuilding aspects into its work, thus helping to bridge a potential gap between peacekeeping and later peacebuilding efforts there.

We would welcome increased interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, more particularly when the Council works on mandates for United Nations missions. We are confident that the ongoing review process will strengthen this relationship and enable the Commission to make full use of its advisory role and the important contributions it can make to this process. In this context, we believe that Sierra Leone — and that is a point that has already been made a number of times — is a model case for peacebuilding with the support of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Government's commitment to creating long-term peace and stability, with the firm support of the international community aligned behind the country's agenda for change, as well as the United Nations Joint Vision, emphasizes the principle of national ownership and helps to avoid duplication through enhanced coordination.

Finally, I would like to thank the Japanese presidency of the Security Council for preparing the draft presidential statement, which has Austria's full support.

Mr. Wolff (United States of America): My Government is pleased to participate in this debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. Foreign Minister Okada's personal participation and the Secretary-General's direct involvement illustrate the importance of this debate. We are also pleased that the Managing Director of the World Bank joined this discussion. We strongly support closer cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank in the field of peacebuilding. We also welcome the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and we are especially honoured by the presence of the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, the Defence Minister of Sierra Leone and the Justice Minister of Timor-Leste. We thank them for sharing their insights. It is entirely fitting that the Security Council should begin its debate by listening to those on whose shoulders the success of peace processes rests: the national authorities and peoples of conflict-afflicted countries themselves.

National authorities in post-conflict countries face some of the most difficult challenges on Earth. They need to govern in ways that win the confidence not only of their supporters but also often of their former enemies. They must protect their citizens and uphold the rule of law in situations emerging from violence, where impunity and abuses have often been the norm. They need to provide basic services and economic opportunities for their population, while often relying on poorly equipped and inadequately paid staff. Like so many of our colleagues, we believe that it is essential for peacebuilding agendas to be nationally led and nationally owned.

Given the magnitude of the challenges that post-conflict Governments so often face when they seek assistance from the United Nations and other multilateral and bilateral actors, we need to respond more rapidly, more effectively and more efficiently. The Secretary-General's June 2009 report (S/2009/304) presented an agenda for doing just that, and we look forward to receiving his progress report and further

concrete proposals on how to move forward. We look forward to his forthcoming report on the role of women in peacebuilding, and the review of the Peacebuilding Commission will afford us a further opportunity to reflect on the issues raised during this timely debate.

I would like to highlight three areas today: personnel, peacekeeping transitions and the politics of peacebuilding. First, we need to ensure that the international personnel we send into post-conflict environments, especially at senior levels, have the right qualifications, arrive when needed and stay long enough to make a difference. National authorities must be able to count on the good offices of a wise special representative and United Nations team to help keep a political transition on track and to provide advice on a comprehensive, long-term peacebuilding strategy. They should be able to turn to development experts experienced in post-conflict situations to advise them on the best way to jumpstart an economy ravaged by war. They should be able to call in experts to get a district office, police station, local court, prison or government payroll system up and running, to name just a few of the governance and early recovery challenges that require specific expertise.

The United Nations has seasoned experts in many critically needed areas, but it does not have enough of them. Recruitment systems are not nimble enough to tap the potential found both inside and outside of the United Nations system. Several Member States, mine included, are developing national civilian response capabilities. These respective efforts need to be harmonized, and we are encouraged that the Secretary-General has convened a senior advisory group to review international civilian capacities for peacebuilding. We look forward to the review's results, which we hope will be fully synchronized with the ongoing discussions on the global field support strategy and continuing reform of the United Nations human resources management system.

Secondly, we need to focus on peacebuilding activities that pave the way for the responsible departure of international peacekeepers and related personnel. Last week in Dili, post-conflict countries issued a declaration asking us to respect their unique paths to lasting peace and to work with them to build the national capacities to achieve just that.

We often hear, as we did from our speakers today, that when national authorities seek external aid, they do so within the context of achieving self-sufficiency. In particular, post-conflict Governments prefer to rebuild their own criminal justice sectors and security institutions as quickly as possible, rather than rely on the indefinite presence of even warmly-welcomed peacekeepers and outsiders.

United Nations peace operations, United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, regional organizations and bilateral donors all play an important role here. But we must do more to learn the lessons of past successes and setbacks in our efforts together in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Haiti and elsewhere, and improve the coherence of our collective response.

Thirdly, international peacebuilders can better support national authorities when they understand the political context in which they operate — another theme we have heard from others today. Even in countries far removed from armed conflict, the adoption of a national budget, the financing of new roads and bridges, or the overhaul of the defence sector can be a complicated and contentious political exercise. It can be even more so in ones where disputes over national identity, wealth and power may have recently triggered outright violence.

It is tempting to approach institutional reforms or resource allocation only as a technical exercise, but in doing so one risks provoking conflict rather than reducing it. When national actors warn us of lurking dangers, we must listen. Similarly, the international community must have the courage to share its own concerns with our partners about ways in which their actions could undermine a peace process or threaten regional stability. To remain in a position to offer critical yet constructive advice, United Nations personnel, donors and Council members must pay more attention to the political dimensions of peacebuilding.

I thank you, Sir, and the Government of Japan for convening this important and timely debate.

Mr. Issoze-Ngondet (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): At the very outset, I wish to tell you how delighted I am, Sir, to see you preside on behalf of your country, Japan, over this ministerial debate on a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict. I also welcome Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, who wished to participate personally in this debate, and thank him for his significant contribution.

I also thank the Ministers of Afghanistan, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone, for their illuminating statements, which showcased the significant achievements of their respective countries. Finally, I welcome the participation in this debate of Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank, and fully appreciate the valuable support of her institution for the Peacebuilding Commission.

We appreciate the relevance and timeliness of this debate, at a time when the danger to countries emerging from conflict of relapsing into a continuous cycle of violence has become even greater. This approach to preventing the recurrence of conflict ties in with our philosophy in terms of crisis prevention, as reaffirmed by the President of the Gabonese Republic, His Excellency Mr. Ali Bongo Ondimba, in the statement he made on 8 March here in New York on conflict prevention in Africa.

The decision taken by the heads of State and Government at the 2005 World Summit to establish the Peacebuilding Commission resulted from their observation of gaps in the transition from activities to re-establish security and post-conflict reconstruction. Thus, at a time when the Peacebuilding Commission is engaged in reform and in evaluating post-conflict experiences, it may be wise to rethink the comprehensive peacebuilding strategy based on an integrated, coordinated and coherent approach.

Drawing from post-conflict experiences in several African countries, I should now like to share with the Council some thoughts on the main elements of a potential new post-conflict comprehensive peacebuilding strategy.

One of the key conditions for ensuring an exemplary transition from a situation of war to a situation of peace is helping countries emerging from conflict to take responsibility for their own affairs in the political, legal and institutional, security, economic and social spheres. It is therefore critical to create an enabling environment for the peace process by promoting dialogue and reconciliation between the various political actors.

The examples of Sierra Leone, Liberia and Timor-Leste illustrate post-conflict success. Such results are possible only if countries emerging from conflict have the means to achieve the objective of peace. It is in that context that the good offices and assistance of the international community, in particular the United Nations and regional organizations, are necessary.

I should like here to commend the considerable support of the United Nations to the process of restoring peace in several post-conflict countries in Africa. In Liberia, for example, the Economic Community of West African States and the United Nations Mission in Liberia together monitored the elections that marked the end of the terrible civil war in that country. The African Union, which will soon establish a framework for post-conflict reconstruction and development, has made significant efforts in this area, in cooperation with the subregional economic communities, by initiating and concluding numerous peace negotiations, as witnessed by the peace agreements concluded in Burundi, the Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, the Sudan and the Central African Republic.

Gabon has always promoted dialogue as the best way of resolving situations of crisis and conflict. For many years now it has been involved in the political processes of national reconciliation. For example, in the Central African Republic, Gabon successfully headed the inclusive political dialogue in December 2008 with the involvement of the main political forces of the country, which led to the establishment of a national reconciliation Government and an electoral timetable. The signing of peace agreements among the parties to a conflict is not enough to ensure that a peace process is permanent. It is also necessary to strive to ensure the respect and effective implementation, in good faith, of those agreements by the signatories.

In that regard, Gabon welcomes the operation, since 2006, of the Peacebuilding Fund, established to support the efforts of countries emerging from crises to rebuild, to strengthen peace and to respond to immediate threats to post-conflict peace processes.

In Africa, ethnic tensions are frequently among the main causes of conflict. In that context, in countries emerging from conflict, dialogue with the various ethnic groups must be maintained in order to preserve both national cohesion and territorial unity. Indeed, it is when all the ethnic characteristics are taken into account in drawing up a joint development project that the aspirations of populations, recently divided, can crystallize around a national ideal that contains the seed of a shared future. The example of Rwanda, which emerged from a genocidal crisis, is the perfect

illustration of a country of post-conflict internal reconciliation.

In order to achieve such a goal, peace processes must take into account security concerns, including by effectively implementing disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes. Likewise, it is important to ensure constant control of borders that, because they are porous, have become the scene of illicit activities and sources of conflict, such as drug trafficking, organized transnational crime and the unchecked and destabilizing circulation of small arms and light weapons.

In Central Africa, such illicit activities have a significant impact on the peace and security of our countries, in particular those emerging from conflict. In that regard, we welcome the fact that the Security Council, under Gabon's presidency, addressed such issues during its open debate on 19 March 2010 (see S/PV.6288).

In our view, a key element of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy is for countries emerging from conflict to take on the political and security process. That is all the more evident as the other aspects of post-conflict reconstruction — promoting the rule of law, organizing free and transparent elections and economic and social governance — are largely dependent on a stable political and security climate.

As we routinely say, development is another name for peace and stability. A comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding strategy must address the root cause of conflicts, which is poverty. From that standpoint, it would be desirable for the international community, in particular donor countries and international financial institutions, to further focus its financing on development programmes in those countries. The European Union is already doing that by setting up development hubs in some African countries, including the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau.

The economic and social development of countries weakened by conflict is absolutely crucial in order to put them back on the path of growth and to ensure the well-being of their populations, who have long suffered the agonies of war.

The Gabonese delegation supports the draft presidential statement to be endorsed following this debate.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, I would like to thank the Foreign Minister of Japan for having travelled to New York to preside over today's meeting. I would like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for his statement. I welcome Foreign Minister Rassoul of Afghanistan, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank and thank them for their statements. I would also like to welcome the presence of the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina at this meeting.

For some 12 years, the United Nations has actively contributed to post-conflict peacebuilding in the countries and regions concerned. It has achieved evident results and accumulated rich experience. Since the Security Council first discussed the issue of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy in 2001, the international community has increasingly acknowledged that peacebuilding is a complex systemic project that involves the political, security, economic and social spheres, as well as many others, and that only a comprehensive strategy can produce effective results. Here, I wish to make the following points.

First, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, it is necessary to genuinely respect the ownership of the relevant country. As the party shouldering the primary responsibility for peacebuilding in its own country, the country concerned is not only the recipient of assistance, but also an equal partner with the donors in dialogue and cooperation, and its voice should be fully heard and heeded in setting priority areas of assistance.

The international community should take into full consideration the priorities set by the country concerned and formulate a corresponding peacebuilding strategy based on the situation on the ground. There can be no uniform norms for peacebuilding, and donors should not impose their own standards on a recipient country. In implementing a peacebuilding strategy, attention should be paid to capacity-building and personnel training in the country concerned and to fully utilizing that country's available human resources and expertise.

Secondly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, it is necessary to coordinate peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts. The Security Council should

invest more energy in preventive diplomacy so as to prevent the outbreak of conflicts in order to reduce the need for peacekeeping operations and post-conflict reconstruction. To secure a smooth transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, the Security Council should consider peacebuilding issues as soon as it deploys a peacekeeping operation. At the same time, the division of labour between a peacekeeping operation and peacebuilding should be clear so as to avoid duplication of effort.

Thirdly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, more attention should be paid to addressing the root causes of conflicts, in particular economic and social development. This year marks the tenth anniversary of the establishment and implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the United Nations. Judging from the current situation, achieving the MDGs is still a difficult task for many countries emerging from conflict: instead of seeing their economies improve, they find themselves lagging further behind other countries. That poses a new challenge in our peacebuilding efforts. In discussing comprehensive peacebuilding strategies, we should address not only security sector reform, justice and the rule of law, but also development. Only by helping countries emerging from conflict achieve sustainable development as soon as possible so that their populations can enjoy the peace dividend can we provide a solid political basis for peace processes.

Fourthly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, coordination between multilateral institutions and donor countries must be strengthened. The United Nations should build stable cooperative relations with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other international partners so as to effectively integrate the resources of all players. The relevant United Nations organs, such as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, should clarify their division of labour and strengthen cooperation. As an important body of the United Nations system responsible for post-conflict peacebuilding, the Peacebuilding Commission should play a greater role in coordinating the international community's peacebuilding efforts.

The Chinese delegation supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement at the end of this open debate, and I wish to thank the Permanent Mission of Japan for the efforts that it has made in that regard.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany, who will be the last speaker for this morning.

Mr. Wittig: I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate and for inviting me to participate in my capacity as Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Japan, in its earlier capacity as Chair of the PBC, contributed immensely to building a strong case for the need for a comprehensive, integrated and multidimensional approach to peacebuilding. I will be brief, as I do not want to keep Council members any longer from their well-deserved lunch.

The Security Council should consider ways to maximize the use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role. To this end, a stronger, organic and more dynamic linkage between the Council and the Commission is required throughout the various phases of the Council's consideration of certain situations on its agenda. Concretely, the Commission's advice on early peacebuilding activities carried out by peacekeepers could help the Security Council to clarify and monitor progress in the implementation of the mandates of peacekeeping missions.

By capitalizing on this viable mechanism for advice and monitoring, the Council would be able to focus on the most immediate threats to international peace and security while maintaining a closer and substantive watching brief on countries which have moved ahead on the continuum of peace. In doing so, the Council would be able to capitalize on the PBC's flexible working methods, thus enabling the Council to reach out more broadly to relevant actors at the country level.

Today, I would like to be put into practice some form of the Commission's advisory functions to the Council by sharing with the membership a few points emanating from the most recent activities undertaken by the PBC at the policy level.

A peacebuilding approach should be based on a common vision among the multiple actors usually engaged in a post-conflict situation. In promoting a common vision, and in addition to strengthening its

linkages with the Security Council, the PBC is increasingly focused on forging partnerships with the international financial institutions and major regional actors in order to help build coherence. We need to promote longer-term political and financial support that bolsters the nexus between security and socioeconomic development, and to ensure the delivery of concrete peace dividends. We need to support national ownership by focusing early attention on national capacity development, particularly in core Government functions. We need to deepen analysis of critical peacebuilding challenges and consistently identify potential threats to peacebuilding processes. And we need to focus attention on and address complex regional challenges to peacebuilding, such as narcotics and small arms trafficking.

Around each of these objectives, we need to take forward the work and tailor our responses to the specific needs of the country concerned and the will of its people. Our actions need to be demand-driven and their results must be nationally owned. For example, we will focus on and divide labour around critical such peacebuilding priorities as the security sector, the rule of law, reintegration, economic revitalization and youth employment.

The PBC will therefore continue to explore concrete measures to deepen the United Nations collaboration with the main actors at the country level. It will promote mutual accountability between host Governments and partners, and monitor progress towards meeting critical peacebuilding objectives. This work will require visible and sustained support from the Security Council, the general membership and the United Nations leadership. To this end, the PBC will continue to improve its working methods, sharpen and diversify its tools of engagement, and promote broader and more coherent engagement by its individual members.

We all know by now that peacebuilding is not a linear process and that it takes many years to build the national will, capacities and institutions needed to sustain peace. The lack of a common vision and coherence among the multiple actors in post-conflict situations is a real challenge that undermines our collective efforts to support countries on the path of sustainable peace. While the United Nations is only one among these actors, it carries the legitimacy and political weight that confer leadership upon its role in many post-conflict situations. We must live up to this image and to that expectation.

The President: There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list. I therefore intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting was suspended at 1.25 p.m.

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6299th meeting

Friday, 16 April 2010, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Takasu	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Vukašinović
	Brazil	Mr. Nina
	China	Mr. Long Zhou
	France	Ms. Dumont
	Gabon	Mr. Onanga Ndiaye
	Lebanon	Mr. Assaf
	Mexico	Mr. Morales Barba
	Nigeria	Mr. Adamu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Mr. Gümrükçü
	Uganda	Mr. Mugerwa
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harvey
	United States of America	Mr. Donegan

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-31773 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President: I would like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Armenia, Bangladesh and Nepal, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration without the right to vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Hernández-Milian (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is an honour for Costa Rica to speak today, in its capacity as Chair of the Human Security Network, on behalf of Network members Austria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand and Slovenia, and of South Africa as an observer.

We would like to thank you, Mr. President, and your delegation for having organized this timely debate on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which reminds us of the importance of taking a comprehensive and integrated approach to the whole concept of peacebuilding in order to achieve greater clarity and coherence. We also welcome the presence of the various ministers here today and the statements by the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

The Human Security Network would like to take this opportunity to reflect on the achievements, existing gaps and priorities in our peacebuilding endeavours from a human security standpoint.

In recent years, we have witnessed how decisions within the United Nations system have increasingly taken the peacebuilding perspective into account. The United Nations has recognized that preventing the recurrence of conflict goes beyond the implementation of any peace agreement, and t early peacebuilding strategy is indispensal fostering development and creating con conducive to sustainable peace. The instit expression of that conviction was the establishn the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2005.

Reinforcing the effectiveness of our col peacebuilding efforts remains one of the g challenges to keeping the 2005 promises Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) m useful contribution to our discussions on this issu

We must continue to promote a synchroniz integrated approach to peacekeeping peacebuilding. Peacebuilding should no long considered the last stage or an exit strateg peacekeeping operations. On the co peacebuilding is now mandated in some peacek operations. The Human Security Network calls inclusion of peacebuilding activities in all oper beginning with the early stages, that is in the d and strategic planning of missions. There shoul be regular communication and ongoing coordi between the Department of Peacekeeping Oper the bodies within the peacebuilding architectu the relevant national agencies.

As stated in the Brahimi report,

> "When complex peace operations do g the field, it is the task of the oper peacekeepers to maintain a secure environment for peacebuilding, and peacebuilders' task to support the political, and economic changes that create a environment that is self-sustaining." (*S/200 para. 28*)

From a human security perspective, the Ne believes that strengthening the capacity of authorities is key to meeting the basic needs o populations.

In terms of United Nations capaciti peacebuilding, the Network believes that it is imp to strengthen the bodies that make up peacebuilding architecture, namely, the Peacebu Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office a Peacebuilding Fund. In that regard, we look forw discussions on the issue of expanding the po

experts and civilian volunteers for rapid deployment in providing assistance in peacebuilding tasks. Those duties include security sector reform, strengthening institutions and reinforcing judicial systems — activities that depend upon good cooperation between military and civilian actors. As such, we also look forward to the recommendations of the United Nations civilian capacity review.

In order to promote peacebuilding, more technical, legal and financial assistance for the strengthening of national democratic institutions and governance needs to be provided on the basis of process-oriented and sound strategies. Political stability largely depends upon the legitimacy, credibility, integrity and transparency of those institutions, in particular in areas such as security, justice and elections.

Security sector reform is a crucial element in the stabilization and reconstruction process. In acknowledging that there is no exclusive model in place for security sector reform, we are certain that the ongoing goal of United Nations security sector reform will make a valuable contribution to supporting States and societies in developing effective, inclusive and accountable security institutions. The Human Security Network encourages the work carried out by the United Nations inter-agency Security Sector Reform Task Force as the mechanism that ensures a broad and coherent approach as part of the mandates of each of the Organization's entities. Furthermore, we support the role of the United Nations in mobilizing coordinated and comprehensive international support for national security-sector reform programmes.

Supporting the consolidation and ownership of national justice institutions is fundamental to building the capacity of States to peaceably settle disputes. That could be supported by both judicial and non-judicial transitional justice mechanisms, such as prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations for victims, institutional reform and commissions to resolve post-displacement disputes over property and land. That should be done while taking the national context into account. Mechanisms such as those could, in the end, contribute to increasing accountability and facilitating the consolidation of peace and stability.

In post-conflict societies, elections are also a central element of national ownership in rebuilding the State. When necessary, electoral assistance should be included as an important component of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy. The United Nations has built up valuable experience in providing assistance to Member States that have requested help in facilitating a steady democratic transition. In that regard, the role and support of the international community are fundamental to ensuring an adequate peacebuilding process.

Peacebuilding processes are an opportunity to rebuild social relations. Socio-economic development models and the design of public policies should promote social stability through the protection of human rights and the participation of every individual and social group. Promoting social integration is also important for political dialogue, national reconciliation and the peaceful co-existence of communities with profound post-conflict resentments and grievances. Increased funding is required for supporting reintegration programmes for internally displaced persons and to support refugees, as well for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes for former combatants. In addition, the need for assistance to victims should be recognized.

Extreme poverty and inequality are threats to the consolidation of peace. Greater investment in short-, medium- and long-term programmes would contribute to reactivating economies and creating employment opportunities, as well as to reducing the social risk of vulnerable groups and helping them to have more confidence in the peace process. It is important to ensure an adequate programmatic response that has a human-centred approach, helps fragile Governments that face difficulties in providing access to basic services and avoids the risk of the re-emergence of chronic vulnerabilities. Areas such as health and education are of strategic importance in ensuring that peace dividends are realized as soon as possible.

The Human Security Network welcomes the work being done by the Peacebuilding Commission thorough the country-specific configurations to include women and young people in peacebuilding processes. The Network would like to highlight the need to include the gender perspective and to promote equal participation for women in peacebuilding activities while taking into account their specific interests and needs. The empowerment and participation of women and young people have been recognized as crucial elements in the success of any peacebuilding strategy, given their potential for restoring the social fabric.

Finally, we would like to highlight the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and its efforts to build and expand alliances between the United Nations system, regional and subregional organizations, international financial institutions, donors, the private sector and civil society. Those synergies will contribute to establishing a common vision in support of peacebuilding processes in a coherent, comprehensive and strategic manner. We look forward to the upcoming review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, which is being facilitated by the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa. We also look forward to the important discussion on how to improve and scale up the Commission's work. That will be a valuable opportunity for assessing results, considering lessons learned and strengthening the Commission's work and its relationship with other organs and agencies of the United Nations system. We call on the Security Council to make greater use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advice in the Council's deliberations on the relevant situations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, for organizing this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. This debate is opportune and takes place at a time when the general membership of the United Nations is seized with the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). In that regard, the views of Member States will be critical as we take these discussions forward.

Allow me also to welcome the presence and participation earlier today at this important meeting of the Secretary-General, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone and the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

South Africa wishes to associate itself with the statement to be delivered by the Ambassador of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission almost five years ago by both the General Assembly and the Security Council was a step in the right direction in an effort to address the challenges of preventing countries emerging from conflict from relapsing into conflict. The critical role of peacebuilding, therefore, is both to consolidate the gains achieved as a result of the peace process and to prevent relapse into conflict.

South Africa is of the view that peacekeeping operations have an important role to play in early peacebuilding efforts and as such should create an environment conducive to establishing the foundations for sustainable development, the rule of law and good governance. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding should therefore not be viewed as linear, sequential processes. An integrated approach that incorporates early peace building activities during the start up of peacekeeping missions is required to create, maintain and sustain peace. This will ensure the early delivery of peace dividends, which is critical to sustaining and consolidating the peace process. In this regard, integrated peace missions have an important role to play in maximizing the impact of the United Nations response on the ground.

Our experience in African peace missions has shown that peace agreements alone are not sufficient to bring stability to a country and that the holding of successful elections does not on its own ensure long-term stability. Effective communication and inclusive dialogue between national actors and the civilian population are critical to building confidence in the peace process.

South Africa believes that the success of peacebuilding must be directly linked to measurable impacts and concrete deliverables on the ground. These should include the improvement of socio-economic and security conditions. As such, the priorities in the post-conflict environment should centre around four basic pillars of post conflict reconstruction: security sector reform, socio-economic development, justice and reconciliation, and good governance and inclusive participatory systems.

Peacebuilding can be successful only when it is done with the Governments concerned; it cannot be done on behalf of a Government or a country. National ownership must therefore be ensured by aligning peacebuilding activities with the national priorities of the Government concerned. This, we believe, will ensure ownership and the long-term sustainability of the process.

More often than not, countries emerging from conflict are faced with the challenge of a lack or a shortage of the resources needed for immediate reconstruction and development programmes. Ensuring

that sufficient resources are mobilized to assist these fragile States is an important investment in the long-term stability and sustainability of the peace process. The international community has been willing to contribute generously to peacekeeping efforts; it is important that this commitment also be carried into the post-conflict peacebuilding phase. The international community has to avoid putting countries emerging from conflict into the challenging position of having to graduate from a well-resourced peacekeeping operation to an under-resourced peacebuilding process.

It is very important in this regard to devise a funding mechanism that would ensure adequate and sustainable resources to countries emerging from conflict. Financial and flexible donor support is therefore critical to allowing post-conflict States to deal with the myriad challenges that confronts them. The role of the international financial institutions in recognizing the peculiar needs of post-conflict countries and in providing flexible financing can therefore not be overemphasized.

In conclusion, my delegation is of the view that the review of the Peacebuilding Commission will offer yet another opportunity for the international community, and the United Nations in particular, to reflect on these challenges and to position themselves to address peacebuilding in a more integrated and holistic manner.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-Kook (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to express my appreciation to Foreign Minister Okada and Ambassador Takasu of Japan, in the presidency of the Security Council, for convening this very timely open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

Post-conflict peacebuilding plays a crucial role for countries recovering from strife, as it aims to preserve the results achieved after hostilities have ended and to prevent the recurrence of conflicts. We established the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) five years ago so that such countries might smoothly undergo the transition from a situation of conflict to that of reconstruction and development. However, the PBC has experienced a number of difficulties in fulfilling its goals due to a lack of financial and human resources, and also as a result of the shortcomings inherent in having neither a comprehensive mandate nor an integrated modus operandi. Against this backdrop, I would like to convey some of my thoughts on the pertinent issues concerning peacebuilding.

First of all, we need to closely examine the issue of how to secure financial resources and effective budget allocation. I recently had the privilege of visited Sierra Leone as a member of the PBC to review the peacebuilding process there. During the visit, I was glad to see that substantive progress had been made in a number of areas. I was also impressed with the coordination between the country-configuration Chair, based here in New York, and the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General, fulfilling the role of a one-stop service as the United Nations figurehead in the field. However, I was quite surprised to learn that there had been no contributions to the multi-donor trust fund for Sierra Leone, other than that made by Canada. The situation is similar in other country configurations, where there are little or no trust funds available, aside from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). Budget allocations cannot be redirected to meet changing and evolving needs.

On a related topic, the funds available to peacebuilding are very small in comparison to the various financial resources disbursed for peacekeeping operations. Since the PBF is funded on a voluntary basis, whereas the peacekeeping budget is an integral part of the United Nations budget, the two cannot be combined or redirected from each other. Hence, we should bear in mind that the funds used for peacebuilding flow directly into the host country, thereby creating an economic benefit as well. As such, I hope that issue can be viewed in the broader perspective of comprehensive United Nations system reform.

Lastly, with regard to the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, there is a misguided and widespread conviction that the two processes ought to be pursued in a sequential approach, in which peacebuilding picks up where peacekeeping left off. However, it is obvious that peacebuilding work cannot suddenly take place in the absence of sustained peacekeeping efforts. Instead, the two processes should be pursued in a two-track parallel approach until security and the rule of law are restored to an adequate level.

For certain candidate countries that have some interest in establishing a new configuration of the PBC,

there are concerns that the initiation of the peacebuilding process will trigger or expedite the withdrawal of peacekeeping operations. To alleviate such concerns, we could look into the possibility of providing military and police training to local forces during the short- and mid-term stages of the peacebuilding process, in tandem with a prolonged phase-out of peacekeeping troops, with a view towards easing apprehensions about the process and facilitating a smooth transition.

On the issue of coherence and linkage in and among individual policy areas, I should like to point out that we need to determine and prioritize the individual policy areas themselves before we talk about issues regarding their coherence and linkage.

The mandate of the PBC needs to be further elaborated upon, so that it may provide more comprehensive and concrete guidelines. We need to flesh out what the priority areas are for peacebuilding in general and, if possible, what portion of the available resources should be allocated to each of those priority areas. One size will not fit all, so there will be a need for custom tailoring for specific countries, but we do need some sort of measuring stick to go by.

I would like to stress that we need improved coordination in the work of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office so that they can mutually reinforce one another in an effective, dynamic and synergistic manner. In that regard, I sincerely hope that a tangible outcome will be attained during the PBC review process later this year so that we can get a clearer picture of the tasks ahead of us and proceed with a concrete course of action.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, the delegation of Egypt welcomes your efforts and those of the delegation of Japan, which holds the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We also welcome your convening of this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, one of the most pertinent issues within the Council's mandate for the maintenance of international peace and security. As Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement, I would like to express my support for the statement to be delivered by the delegation of Bangladesh, coordinator of the Movement, on this very important issue.

Over the past few years, post-conflict peacebuilding has witnessed unprecedented developments, such as the General Assembly's establishment of an integrated system enabling it to play a pivotal role in the coordination of international peacebuilding efforts. In this respect, Egypt reaffirms its full commitment to support the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations through the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. The Commission's activities have gained increased importance through several years of accumulated experience. It is playing an important role in coordinating international and United Nations efforts to prevent countries from relapsing into conflict.

Peacebuilding is a multifaceted and multidimensional process. For one thing, international peace and security cannot be successfully maintained without ensuring the centrality of security sector reform in both the military and social spheres; furthermore, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes may not achieve their objectives unless the essential development, social and economic needs are met. In addition, ensuring sustainable peace requires an enabling environment based on comprehensive national dialogue, social justice, judicial integrity and independence, and the rule of law. These factors must go hand in hand with a comprehensive socio-economic development process based on the national strategies and priorities of countries emerging from conflict.

In this regard, we are witnessing the fading of the clear boundaries which used to define the stages of succession and overlap between conflict resolution, peacekeeping, post-conflict peacebuilding and sustainable development; that is true also of the less well defined interconnection and synchronization among those phases and the roles of the principal organs of the United Nations in dealing with them within a coordinated, mutually reinforcing and inclusive framework.

Recently, calls for the simultaneous start of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations have increased. Egypt believes that such views merit detailed and cautious consideration and recognizes the need to comprehensively study this approach with a

view to strengthening the capacity of Governments in post-conflict countries to shoulder their responsibilities — but without undermining the flow of resources needed to support these efforts. Successful peacekeeping depends on comprehensive peace agreements to which all involved parties adhere and that enjoy wide popular support, in order to create the enabling environment needed to sustain the peace and lay the foundations for a peacebuilding process that will provide Governments with what they need to shoulder their responsibilities in the security and defence sectors. This in turn will make it easier to formulate exit strategies for peacekeeping operations in the countries concerned.

Similarly, due consideration must be given to the overlap between peacebuilding processes and the launch of sustainable development efforts in post-conflict countries. Efforts to lay the foundation for good governance, the rule of law and the application of the principles of democracy and justice in societies will not realize their full potential in communities plagued with poverty, disease, hunger and continued lack of the basic living standards as enshrined in internationally agreed development goals. Thus, it is of the utmost importance to launch a peacebuilding process in an appropriate manner and at the proper time to ensure the successful establishment of the key political, economic and social pillars needed to create an enabling environment for implementing comprehensive development strategies supported by timely, predictable and sustainable financial resources.

The building of comprehensive and sustainable peace in post-conflict countries requires our sincere commitment to several objectives. First, we should maximize the chances of success of peacebuilding efforts through an unconditional and total commitment to the principle of national ownership by post-conflict countries of their national peacebuilding strategies, in which the national authorities are fully responsible for defining, planning and implementing peacebuilding strategies, with the support of the Peacebuilding Commission and in accordance with clear and objective national political, economic, social and development priorities defined without any external pressure.

Second, we should ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission continues to effectively provide advice and proposals, based on in-depth studies and in coordination with all influential actors, with a view to formulating and implementing comprehensive integrated peacebuilding strategies that lay the foundation for sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict.

Third, we should build on the accumulated multidimensional experiences of the United Nations system in the field of peacebuilding through the development of clear, defined, balanced, synchronized and equal relations among the Peacebuilding Commission, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, with full respect for their mandates as defined by the Charter.

Fourth, we should ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission is actively involved at the early stages of peacebuilding processes, which can coincide with peacekeeping operations, and that it cooperates fully with national stakeholders to create an enabling environment and incentives to launch a comprehensive peacebuilding process within the country concerned.

Fifth, we should ensure a genuine international political commitment to peacebuilding processes and provide the needed civilian capacities, technical capabilities, financial resources and best practices, through the Peacebuilding Commission, to support these processes.

Sixth, we should maximize benefits from available capacities of the United Nations, the international financial institutions and donor countries to support peacebuilding efforts. In that regard, it is imperative to establish a monitoring, evaluation and follow-up mechanism to ensure the implementation of all national and international commitments made within the framework of nationally agreed peacebuilding priorities.

Seventh, and finally, we should ensure that the priorities of international funding mechanisms, including the Peacebuilding Fund, are consistent with the national peacebuilding priorities of the countries concerned. We must consider innovative methods to bolster the resources of such mechanisms, in particular through the Peacebuilding Fund, so that these resources can be the cornerstone of the funding of peacebuilding strategies.

The President: I now call on the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Briz Gutiérrez (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful to you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting on peacebuilding, as well as for having prepared the concept paper circulated on 1 April (see S/2010/167).

We would also like to thank the Ministers from Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the representative of the World Bank for their participation.

As is well known, after an internal conflict of over four decades, Guatemala signed its peace agreements in December 1996. The process that led to that act and, in particular, the subsequent peacebuilding process, has left us with many lessons, some of which we would like to share in the context of the questions raised in the concept paper. Unfortunately, in a five-minute statement, only some general concepts can be formulated, which, though they may not sound like anything new, do contain important observations. I will mention eight points.

The first thing is that every peacebuilding process is unique and that in this area, as in so many others, there is no universally valid formula. We are often asked if our own experience is transferable to other countries. Rather than respond with a clear yes or no, we tend to say that it depends on the specific circumstances of each country and each situation.

The second point that stands out for us is the cardinal importance of domestic actors — former parties to a conflict and civil society — having a sense of ownership of the process. Not only is this logical, but, in the absence of a sense of ownership, it would be difficult to build productive relationships between domestic actors and international cooperation entities.

Thirdly, if there is a sense of ownership and functioning national institutions, the country will be paradoxically better prepared to tolerate a higher level of participation on the part of the international community in the decision-making process. Guatemala serves as an example of this. The United Nations played a fundamental role in every step involved in the winning and building of peace, but it carried out this role at the request of the domestic parties and not as an external actor with its own agenda. Thus, many viewed the Organization as another stakeholder in the peace process, and not as an extraneous presence.

This leads me to our fourth point, which is the crucial importance of international cooperation in peacebuilding processes. Without a doubt, during the first years of implementation of the commitments contained in our own peace accords, external financing acted as a catalyst for many projects, programmes and policies that would have been hard to carry out without such support. Guatemala underlines the importance of avoiding what the concept paper (S/2010/167) calls the "peacebuilding gaps" between security and economic recovery.

The fifth point is that peacebuilding must necessarily address those sources of tension that led to conflict in the first place, be they due to ideological polarization, different historical grievances or serious economic and social disparities. At least in our case, the peace accords can be interpreted as a sort of road map that enabled the peacebuilding process to tackle head-on the main sources of tension that fueled the conflict. The very titles of the various accords illustrate the point — including, in particular, the Human Rights Accord, and the Accords on the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples, on Socioeconomic and Agrarian Issues, and on the Strengthening of Civilian Power and the Role of the Army in a Democratic Society.

A sixth lesson to be drawn from our experience is that peacebuilding is by definition a holistic process. Multiple and diverse commitments must be addressed simultaneously, and not in an isolated or sequential way. This, too, makes clear the enormous complexity of moving forward with such a process.

Seventh, it takes a long time to reverse a number of aspects of the conflict that existed prior to the peacebuilding process, since they have become entrenched in attitudes and modes of behaviour. For example, Guatemala still suffers, to this day from the culture of impunity that was born in the shadow of the internal conflict and now shelters delinquent activities. We therefore turned once again to the United Nations, devising an innovative arrangement to strengthen the rule of law in the form of the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala. My main point is that, 16 years after our internal conflict came to an end, we continue to suffer its consequences.

Eighth and last, just as the concept paper has identified a gap between security and economic recovery, peacebuilding is often accompanied by a gap in expectations. At least in our case, logically, the

peace accords did not resolve all the age-old and structural problems facing our society, but we continue to strive to close that gap.

That concludes the essence of the experience that we wished to share with the Council today.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Gutiérrez (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the permanent representative of Bangladesh in his capacity as the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) coordinator for the Non-Aligned Movement. In addition, my delegation should like briefly to address a number of issues that we believe to be relevant to the matter that brings us together today.

The convening of this Security Council debate on post-conflict peacebuilding at a time when we are immersed in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission gives us the opportunity to emphasize the importance of making substantive progress in that process. We hope that the process will result in agreement on the provision of sufficient means and capacities to enable the PBC to fully carry out its advisory role to both the General Assembly and Security Council, and to work more effectively in adopting comprehensive peacebuilding strategies that promote security, development and governance, in close coordination with all the agencies of the United Nations system.

A specific goal should be to enable the PBC, equipped with the necessary means and human resources, to fulfil its advisory role while consistently and coherently articulating cooperation policies aimed at strengthening peace processes in countries emerging from conflict.

A quick review of history will show that a number of countries that emerged from situations of conflict relapsed into violence or that they lacked the capacity to stay on the path to sustainable socio-economic development and were thus vulnerable to the latent possibility of renewed conflict. This is further confirmation that priority should be given to the link that exists between the concept of security, on the one hand, and social inclusion, the fight against poverty, the strengthening of institutions and the promotion of human rights, on the other. All of these components are integral to the timely re-establishment of peace.

When we speak of peacebuilding, we think of existing conflict situations that, because of their long-standing nature, generate a perverse dynamic of violence and destruction. In order to counter this trend, it is essential to build the social fabric of the country, generate political awareness, implement measures that favour inclusion and convince the private sector of the important role it has to play in the process of reconstructing its country, together with the other national institutions. Furthermore, the principal of national ownership is the main foundation upon which the entire peacebuilding process should be built. On this point, I should like to reiterate that the commitment and participation of the private sector are key to ensuring the economic recovery of a country emerging from conflict.

We have already mentioned the intrinsic relationship between security and development. Trade and business can flourish only in an atmosphere of peace and stability. At the same time, however, peace requires significant flows of trade and investment that generate employment in order to combat pockets of poverty and establish a framework for sustainable development, which is an effective component for neutralizing the threat of violence.

In this context, it is essential, in economic and development terms, that the PBC, in coordination with the international financial institutions and regional organizations, be able to continue carrying out medium- and long-term follow-up to establish the conditions needed to attract private investment and ensure the effective channeling of cooperation flows through effective accountability mechanisms.

In securing and consolidating peace in nations embroiled in conflict, we do not always follow the logical chain of first establishing security and stability, then maintaining peace and, after that, setting up comprehensive development plans aimed at consolidating that peace. Historically, experience has shown us that there is an increasing need to include early peacebuilding activities in the implementation of peacekeeping processes. In this regard, it is vitally important that, in the implementation of such measures, the PBC can play a relevant advisory role in planning those efforts, in close coordination with the other relevant United Nations bodies that are directly responsible for economic and social development, such as the Economic and Social Council.

At the same time, bearing in mind the role of the peacebuilding architecture in consolidating peace, Peru believes that it is not viable to keep the work of the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund on separate tracks. On the contrary, there must be close interaction between them. The Commission must play a relevant role in the formulation of resource allocation policies for specific areas. Given the follow-up role played by the PBC in peacebuilding processes, it is time for us to consider creating a mechanism that would provide for synergies and feedback between the Commission and the Fund, bodies that share one common goal and value: promoting and building peace.

All Members of the Organization have a shared responsibility to strengthen the United Nations system in order to maintain, preserve and build peace worldwide. Today we have an opportunity to bring this important goal closer by taking concrete steps to strengthen the capacity of the Peacebuilding Commission to fully and faithfully carry out the role entrusted to it.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your participation in today's open debate and for the important statement of your Foreign Minister. We would also like to express our appreciation for your usual and very able stewardship of the Security Council.

In our view, conflict prevention and peacebuilding remain the greatest challenges facing the United Nations today. While peacebuilding is an essential component of conflict management that entails parallel and coordinated efforts on the security, political, humanitarian and development fronts, time has shown that it remains a complex undertaking, requiring further and closer review of ground realities and expectations, as well as continued extensive consultations. The inputs thus gathered needs to be factored into our collective action to forge a coherent, efficient and predictable response to the peacebuilding needs of countries emerging from conflict.

As pointed out by some speakers, the task of peacebuilding is further complicated by the proven risks of relapse into conflict. It is therefore very important for the international community to pay special attention to the stresses and strains on the system, particularly in the immediate aftermath of conflict — a period normally marked by challenges and opportunities alike. The challenges of a relapse into conflict can be tackled by undertaking more coordinated assessment and planning for peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities, in which both processes must be explicitly defined and clearly identified to ensure a coherent approach to a sustainable peace.

We must learn to recognize that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are each specialized disciplines, though with cross-cutting themes. These disciplines can work together by exploring pragmatic avenues of partnership through a dynamic interplay between the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the international financial institutions, the troop-contributing countries and the relevant departments of the Secretariat. As experience has shown, regrettably, this does not necessarily happen.

Early conflict management also offers some unique opportunities. There are the aspirations of the people affected by the conflict, who are determined to seize the opportunity of peace and to turn a new page for a better future. We must learn to build upon these aspirations by giving them full ownership of the process through active engagement in decision-making and investment in national capacity-building. At the same time, the international community rightly expects the local actors to inculcate the required sense of responsibility and values of governance that correspond to the ownership, and to infuse confidence among the partners.

We understand that there is no silver bullet that can precipitate conditions conducive to implementing peacebuilding strategies. Such conditions — security and political stability — can be attained only if the aim of the collective peacebuilding endeavour is to win peace and not to earn or impose it. Building such peace would require the right prioritization of the targeted areas of development, while tapping and harnessing the civilian capacities available locally before resorting to regional or international expertise. Similarly, some level of understanding of local sensitivities and a degree of flexibility in imposing conditionalities are also essential. Further progress on democracy, gender issues and human rights can only be incremental. Undue emphasis on these issues, especially in the early recovery phase, would remain counterproductive.

Sustained peacebuilding efforts also require predictable and sustained funding and the allocation of

adequate resources. This requires the cooperation and support of Member States, particularly the donors, as well as enhanced collaboration with the international financial institutions, which need to show more operational ingenuity in their assistance programmes. From the point of view of enhancing national ownership and capacity, it is also important that most of the funding be provided through Government channels. In the context of resource allocations, the steady portfolio growth in the Peacebuilding Fund is indeed gratifying, and the efficiency of the Fund will only increase with more transparency.

Pakistan is committed to the objectives of United Nations peacebuilding. As the largest troop-contributing country, we are cognizant of the importance of this endeavour. We were among the pioneers of the concept of a dedicated United Nations institutional mechanism for peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is an embodiment of that idea.

The PBC, with its unique composition and specific mandate, holds a pivotal role in the peacebuilding architecture. We are happy to note that the PBC has made steady progress in the first five years of its existence. For this, the role of the Chair, previous Chairs, and the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations, is definitely commendable. As Member States review the peacebuilding architecture this year, it is important to note that the objectives of peacebuilding will be advanced by utilizing the full potential of the PBC, as outlined in General Assembly resolution 60/180, and also by aligning its functions with lessons we should have learned thus far.

For effective response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, it would make more sense if the PBC were engaged from the outset of United Nations involvement, particularly where integrated peacekeeping missions are deployed. This would only facilitate more cohesion between the objectives of peacebuilding and peacekeeping.

I will conclude by urging a more sustained focus of the Member States on peacebuilding. In this regard, our delegation greatly values your presence in the Council, Sir, as well as Japan's active engagement over time in peacekeeping and peacebuilding processes.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Graham (New Zealand): Peacebuilding is one of the most complex and important challenges we collectively face. Its effectiveness helps to determine whether post-conflict societies achieve sustainable peace and development or descend once again into bloody conflict. It also strongly influences prospects for preserving and building upon the gains achieved through the considerable investments made in post-conflict countries by the international community. With peacebuilding tasks increasingly forming an important and sometimes central element of Council-mandated missions, it is important that there be a shared understanding of what is required for their effective implementation and that lessons learned be applied system-wide.

New Zealand has been a key contributor to numerous peacebuilding operations, including United Nations missions in Timor-Leste and United Nations-mandated operations in Bougainville, Afghanistan and Solomon Islands. We have also provided significant bilateral peacebuilding assistance within our region and beyond. Our experiences have taught us much about both the very real impact such programmes can make on the ground and the practical challenges in their effective implementation. Our views on this topic are set out more fully in the written statement we have distributed, and I will focus my comments on a number of key messages we would like to convey to the Council, based on our peacekeeping experiences.

First, while the crucial importance of meaningful national leadership, ownership and engagement, and of the need for this to inform every stage of planning and implementation are widely acknowledged, all too often this awareness is not adequately reflected in practice. Early attention to mechanisms for building and sustaining national ownership is essential.

The partnership framework agreed last year between the Solomon Islands Government and the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) is one example of how this can be achieved in practice. In addition to facilitating national ownership and aligning national and mission priorities and expectations, it has provided a mechanism for establishing agreed benchmarks for monitoring progress. Moreover, it is also a living document that can be adjusted to meet changing circumstances.

Secondly, national capacity-development lies at the heart of peacebuilding and must be a central

consideration in the formulation and implementation of peacebuilding mandates from day one. To be effective, capacity-building programmes must be based on coherent strategies developed in cooperation with local partners. These strategies should be drawn from robust needs assessments to ensure that they are guided both by realities and by requirements on the ground and that they can effectively identify and further develop existing national capacities, rather than automatically substitute international personnel.

These issues must be fully addressed before significant investments are made in capacity-building activities with long-term implications. The availability of effective analytical tools has the potential to assist with this. We welcome in this regard the Secretariat's current efforts to develop a more strategic approach to identifying, prioritizing and sequencing critical early peacebuilding tasks.

Thirdly, national capacity-building requires specialized skills and experiences beyond those required for traditional peacekeeping operations. But it is clear that our current ability to identify, recruit and deploy sufficient numbers of personnel who possess these skills is inadequate. The completion of the review currently under way of civilian personnel required for peacebuilding operations is therefore a priority of the utmost importance. We hope the review will also include suggestions on how to achieve appropriate balance between the technical knowledge and development expertise required for effective peacebuilders.

Given the central importance of rule of law capacities in many post-conflict situations, New Zealand supports in principle the Secretary-General's call for enhanced police standing capacity and the establishment of a limited standing capacity for justice and corrections expertise, provided they are based on a clear needs assessment and undertaken in the context of a broader framework for generating civilian capacities.

We also hope that the review will consider the full range of other possible options for sourcing civilian expertise, including better use of United Nations Volunteers, standby arrangements, regional pools of expertise and, potentially, partnerships with the private sector. We will also look to the Secretary-General's proposed staff mobility policy to provide options for better leveraging existing peacebuilding expertise from within the United Nations system when it is presented to the Fifth Committee later this year.

Fourthly, effective leadership is a potentially decisive factor in the success of peacebuilding operations. We welcome the steps taken by the Secretariat to enhance the selection and preparation of appropriately skilled, experienced and balanced leadership teams and to provide these teams with sufficient in-country support. These efforts must be intensified.

Finally, effective coordination and synergies among the broad range of actors on the ground are essential to preventing gaps or duplication of effort and to providing an environment with the agility to respond effectively to crises and to rapidly changing circumstances.

New Zealand welcomes improvements made to the coordination of humanitarian response in recent years as a result of the introduction of the cluster approach. Likewise, the strengthening of United Nations efforts to deliver as one is also important throughout the life of a peacebuilding mission to enable the most efficient and effective application of peacebuilding resources across the United Nations system.

Providing missions with coordinated and coherent support is also important. New Zealand has welcomed the recent steps to implement more integrated planning and operational management processes at United Nations Headquarters, and we encourage the Secretariat to keep this work under continuous review.

New Zealand is proud of its contribution to peacebuilding operations to date, but we are also very aware of the complex challenges such missions pose and of how much we and the international community have yet to learn about how best to tackle these in practice. I hope that today's open debate can take us another step closer towards such an understanding.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Mr. Muita (Kenya): I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to share my thoughts on this very important debate. We view this debate as being most timely, given the current review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). It is our hope that the

deliberations in the Council today will serve to enrich this ongoing process.

The Secretary-General, in his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), notes that threats to peace are often more imminent in the earliest post-conflict stages. It is this crucial period that offers us a window of opportunity to build lasting foundations for durable peace. It is therefore imperative that peacebuilding commence at the very outset of the cessation of hostilities. Thereafter, peacebuilding efforts must be nurtured and sustained until stability is re-established.

It was with great foresight that the 2005 World Summit decided to establish the PBC to fill the peacebuilding gaps in United Nations efforts to consolidate peace in countries coming out of conflict. Countries emerging from conflict are fragile and could easily slide back into war after the Blue Helmets depart. They need to be helped to build sustainable peace through security, development and human rights being integrated into a single coherent approach to help close gaps inherent in such situations. That also calls for the marshalling of the resources required to target those national capacities that offer the best chance of making peace irreversible and those that address the root causes of conflict.

Kenya recognizes the pivotal role that the PBC has been playing in consolidating peace in countries emerging from conflict situations. We have witnessed first-hand the PBC's engagement in several such situations on our continent, for example, in Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic. However, we must help the PBC to better deliver its mandate to the affected countries. In that regard, my delegation believes that the PBC should come into the picture at a very early stage in the peacebuilding process. There is equally the need for the PBC to work very closely with national and regional actors in peace consolidation efforts.

To ensure that countries emerging from conflict do not relapse into chaos, peacebuilding strategies must dedicate a larger portion of their work to promoting sustainable economic development, strengthening institutions of governance and maintaining democratic norms while involving women in the process. Equally important in peace consolidation is the principle of national ownership. It is imperative that countries on the PBC's agenda identify with those objectives and feel that they own the peacebuilding process for sustained and meaningful peace to be established.

The potential inherent in the PBC as an advisory body of the General Assembly and the Security Council should be fully utilized. The ongoing review should therefore define how the PBC can create a positive synergy in order to consolidate the efforts of all partners. The United Nations agencies, the private sector and civil society organizations can all complement the PBC's efforts to ensure a successful peacebuilding strategy.

Kenya, as a member of the PBC's Burundi configuration, would like to emphasize the importance of economic recovery, socio-economic integration and the development dimension in any peacebuilding process. From that perspective, my delegation would like to emphasize the need to anchor peacebuilding gains to regional integration initiatives. It is important to assist countries emerging from conflict in integrating their economies in the wider benefits accruing from regionalization. In the case of Burundi, my delegation reiterates its support to help the country nurture its fledgling peace by enhancing its greater economic development through mutually beneficial membership in the East African Community.

To conclude, let me once again reaffirm Kenya's full support and commitment to ensuring that the Peacebuilding Commission is better adapted and suited to fulfilling its mandate in order to ensure sustainable peace and development are attained in those countries emerging from post-conflict situations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): Let me congratulate you, Mr. President, and Japan for organizing this timely and important debate.

Peacebuilding is rightly emerging as one of the central challenges facing the United Nations. Conflicts can erode State capacity, unravel the fabric of society and hinder economic development. They also undermine regional stability and create ungoverned spaces within which armed groups and organized crime can flourish. Far too frequently, countries emerge from violence only to return to conflict within a short period and at tremendous cost. As the Security Council considers this question, it is important to analyse the

record so far. In that respect, there is much to be learned from the international engagement in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. Canada has supported peace consolidation in all three countries.

In Afghanistan, Canada's approach marshals civilian and military contributions behind a single comprehensive strategy that aligns Canadian support with the priorities of the Government of Afghanistan. As a result, Canada has focused on six mutually reinforcing priorities: enabling the Afghan National Security Forces to sustain a more secure environment; strengthening Afghan capacity to deliver basic services; providing humanitarian aid; facilitating cross-border dialogue with Pakistan; enhancing capacity for democratic governance; and, finally, facilitating Afghan-led political reconciliation.

In addition, Canada strongly supports the international community's renewed commitment to supporting the transition to full Afghan leadership of security issues, as agreed during the London Conference in January. While the context of each post-conflict country differs, in our view the underlying principles behind that approach are an important step forward and should be applied more widely.

Canada is also honoured to chair the Sierra Leone configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). As a success story for multilateral peacebuilding, Sierra Leone's experience highlights several important factors. First, strong national leadership has enabled political reconciliation and set the stage for several rounds of successful elections, thereby cementing democratic governance and rebuilding trust. Similarly, efforts to combat corruption, decentralize Government and provide essential services are helping to provide Sierra Leoneans with a tangible peace dividend.

Secondly, Sierra Leone's success has been accomplished with steady international support. Strong international military commitment, including a sizeable United Nations peacekeeping force, helped stabilize the country and end the civil war. Considerable budget support and a comprehensive security sector reform programme in the years immediately following the conflict laid solid foundations for further progress. Since 2007, the Peacebuilding Commission has also worked to ensure that Sierra Leone has the international attention and political support needed to complete the peacebuilding process.

Thirdly, the approach to peacebuilding in Sierra Leone is a model worth replicating. The international community has aligned its efforts with the priorities outlined in the Agenda for Change and Sierra Leone's own national strategy for peace consolidation and economic development. In that context, the United Nations family has also united its various mandates and resources under a common strategy, the United Nations Joint Vision for Sierra Leone. The Sierra Leone configuration of the PBC has not only endorsed that approach, but also actively oriented its work according to national priorities. Such steps have emphasized national leadership, reduced duplication, eliminated unnecessary administrative burdens and strengthened coordination.

Finally, it is worth noting that the outstanding peacebuilding issues in Sierra Leone are representative of challenges elsewhere. A large unemployed youth population represents a latent risk of instability. While a longer-term solution depends on economic growth and private sector investment, immediate action is needed to ensure that the youth contribute to peace consolidation instead of being used by political or criminal actors for violent purposes.

Canada has also provided support to peacebuilding in Timor-Leste. From 2006 until early this year, Canada contributed police experts to the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste through the Canadian Police Arrangement, helping to increase stability and further professionalize the national police force. Since 2008, Timor-Leste has also been a member of Canada's Military Training and Cooperation Programme, which provides capacity-building through military and language training. In Timor-Leste, as elsewhere, the international community also learned a vital lesson. Successful peacebuilding requires sustained commitment.

(*spoke in French*)

Much remains to be done but several overarching principles are emerging. It is clear that peacebuilding should start as early as possible, that it is complementary to peacekeeping, and that it requires considerable resources and sustained commitment. The Security Council should continue to ensure that the core risks of relapse into conflict in a given context are identified and addressed in a targeted manner, including through closer cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission.

Similarly, international support must be more comprehensive, better integrated and more sensitive to local context. Enhanced coordination among security, humanitarian and development actors is also essential, including between the United Nations and the World Bank, as well as with respect to the promising work of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development on principles and modalities for engagement in post-conflict States. Fully implementing the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) is one key component in achieving these objectives.

Finally, peacebuilding must above all strengthen national ownership. The international community should work to establish capacity for effective governance and align support behind national priorities as quickly as possible. By drawing on local, regional and international expertise, the international community also can and should do a better job mobilizing the civilian expertise necessary to support national authorities, including through enhanced South-South cooperation. Canada awaits with interest the completion of the Secretariat's study on civilian capacity within the United Nations system.

As a country strongly committed to peacebuilding, Canada is contributing to progress in each of these areas and will continue to do so in the future.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): Croatia attaches great importance to this timely and relevant debate, the relevance and importance of which are undoubtedly confirmed by the high level of participation in this gathering.

Croatia has aligned itself with the statement to be delivered by the delegation of the European Union on behalf of the Union. However, let me take this opportunity to share a few additional remarks on this important topic.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was established with the main aim of filling peacebuilding gaps between security and reconstruction through innovative yet coordinated, coherent and integrated approaches directed at post-conflict recovery, reconstruction and institution-building. In that regard, the PBC's primary task of supporting countries emerging from conflict was conceived as one bringing together all relevant actors, marshalling the requisite resources and providing strategic and concrete recommendations in order to improve the coordination of those efforts within and outside the United Nations.

Croatia strongly believes that effective implementation of the PBC's mandate by all stakeholders offers the best way to achieve the three United Nations pillars — security, development and the protection of human rights — all of which are indispensable prerequisites for sustainable peace and long-term stability.

Post-conflict peacebuilding, a phase that should follow the cessation of hostilities, is, in our opinion, just as important as bringing a conflict to an end. In order to prevent the recurrence of conflict, a strong nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be established as soon as possible, based on a coordinated, coherent, integrated approach, the prompt implementation of a peace agreement and in-depth knowledge of the situation on the ground.

In that regard, Croatia would like to stress the important and supportive role played by the Peacebuilding Support Office in drawing up peacebuilding strategies, as well as the valuable contributions of the PBC through its useful and innovative working methods, making use of country-specific configurations and meetings, which have brought new and thought-provoking dimensions to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

On the basis of its own national experience regarding one of the most successful United Nations peacekeeping missions, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium, which contained significant elements of peacebuilding, including demilitarization, reconciliation and institution-building, Croatia supports the Council's intention to further strengthen coherence between peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding in its work. In particular, we view the Council's practice of transforming some former peacekeeping missions into integrated peacebuilding missions as an important step in the right direction towards assisting the PBC in implementing the respective integrated strategic frameworks. Therefore, cooperation between the Council and the PBC in that regard is of utmost importance. However, we still see

room for further improvement. In particular, we should consider the insight that the PBC could bring to Council deliberations regarding specific issues on countries that are on the agendas of both the Security Council and the PBC.

Efforts to date by the PBC to simultaneously address key security, political and social issues through the development of integrated peacebuilding strategies, as witnessed in all four countries on the PBC's agenda, have been extremely important. They have clearly demonstrated that the correlation and synergy among these areas are elements necessary for successful peacebuilding. Furthermore, we believe that a single national strategy instrument encompassing all relevant peacebuilding programmes and activities is a useful innovation deserving further thorough consideration.

Equally, the United Nations, for its part, should follow suit by unifying its own programmes and activities so as to ensure it delivers as one. At the same time, we should not overlook the lessons learned from the country-specific approach: that, while some commonality exists, no one size fits all and that each and every country situation should be thoroughly discussed and acted upon according to its own merits and needs.

In all these efforts, national ownership of the peacebuilding process is of paramount importance. Peacebuilding should not evolve in a vacuum for its own sake, but should build upon available domestic resources and expertise, which introduces a unique perspective otherwise not available to outsiders. This approach allows for the appropriate development and consolidation of necessary national governing structures and policies that are in line with national priorities. This, in turn, opens the way for greater acceptance of a peacebuilding mission by the local population.

In that context, Croatia strongly supports the idea of developing a pool of civilian expertise drawn primarily from regional resources, which would significantly improve delivery by shortening the preparation period and enable immediate deployment of post-conflict stabilization teams. Moreover, Croatia recognizes that the strengthening of civil society is of particular importance in peacebuilding, where non-governmental and civil society organizations may be able to provide a valuable link between the PBC and the strategy endorsed by the local population.

In underscoring the increasing regional dimension of contemporary conflicts, we would encourage further engagement and a deepening of cooperation between the PBC and regional and subregional organizations. A variety of United Nations entities active in particular regions should also be part of the equation.

It is clear that peacebuilding requires a multidimensional approach supported by timely, sustainable, predictable and flexible resources. As a co-founder of the Peacebuilding Fund, Croatia fully recognizes the critical role that peacebuilding funding plays as an early investment towards sustainable peace and development. In this regard, we note with appreciation the special roles that the Fund and the international financial institutions have been playing in peacebuilding efforts. Furthermore, Croatia welcomes efforts by the PBC to engage non-traditional donors and partners in financing its activities, as well as its attempts to ensure that national peacebuilding obligations are fully matched with fulfilled promises by the international community.

Croatia believes that, five years after its establishment, the PBC is now ready to take on further specific situations and add more countries to its agenda. At the same time, we strongly support the PBC's efforts to develop assessment tools to monitor and measure the progress achieved in the implementation of peacebuilding strategies and related activities.

In conclusion, we express our hope that the outcome of this debate will provide an important input to the 2010 review process of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture currently under way, while fully respecting the mandates of the different bodies involved in this issue.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): It is an especially encouraging moment for Australia to speak today before the Council under Japan's presidency, and you, Mr. President, are to be commended for convening today's debate.

There is a lot of discussion, as we know, currently under way in different forums about the importance of peacebuilding. It is essential that that discussion also continue in the Security Council, since peacebuilding

is a necessary — and often the most difficult — element in preventing future conflict and in consolidating the gains achieved by peacekeeping missions. Both of these tasks, of course, are central aims of the Council's work.

I would like to focus today on only a few overarching points that have been borne out of Australia's engagement in addressing current peacebuilding challenges in Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, Solomon Islands, earlier in Bougainville, and more recently through our engagement with Sierra Leone through the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We are contributing further to this debate through the current review of the PBC.

First, we think that peacebuilding needs to be considered at the inception of a peacekeeping mission. There is increasing international recognition that beginning recovery efforts as early as possible in post-conflict situations is critical to helping countries stabilize and provide essential services to their population. As such, the planning of peacekeeping missions should not be seen, of course, as a military task alone, but rather as one that demands a multifaceted effort that combines political, humanitarian and development considerations with the security dimension. This also demands a closer and more organic relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission throughout the Council's consideration of a situation.

Secondly, there are of course no quick fixes to intractable problems. The transition from post-conflict to what we might call normal, while unique in each case, typically takes a long time. There is an imperative to balance the need for rapid and flexible responses to short-term issues against our steady efforts on longer-term goals. Scaling back our engagement too quickly can result in relapse into conflict. Australia learned this lesson the hard way in Timor-Leste, most obviously with the need in 2006 to return peacekeepers who had been withdrawn too quickly. We need to be cognizant of and able to respond to the rapidly changing political and security context and, of course, be prepared to see a challenge through to its conclusion.

Thirdly, while creating and sustaining peace and security is a critical component of peacebuilding, it also requires efforts at State-building. This requires all international actors — whether political, security, humanitarian or development — to develop a shared understanding of all the factors affecting a nation's ability to build a sustainable peace. They need to align their respective efforts with Government priorities and harmonize their activities to get the best results. Australia's long-term approach to helping post-conflict countries aims to address security, development, economic and political issues in this kind of comprehensive and sequenced way.

In Timor-Leste, the United Nations Mission and the Australian-led International Stabilization Force are not only helping to create and sustain peace and security, but moreover significantly providing Timor-Leste with the space to develop its Government and security institutions so that there will not in the future be any need for such an international security presence. They are also providing the space for economic and social development and investment in human resources, both of which will be decisive for the long-term future of Timor-Leste.

Australia's efforts in Timor-Leste in the earliest stages placed priority, obviously, on stabilizing the security situation, responding to humanitarian needs and helping the new Government to start immediately to rebuild the institutions it needed to govern. However, with the benefit of hindsight, we now recognize that a much earlier transition to also ensuring visible, tangible benefits to the poor living in the countryside and the very large numbers of people without jobs throughout all of Timor-Leste was desperately needed. Our new country strategy seeks to correct this imbalance, placing most emphasis on working with the Government to deliver health and education services, improve agricultural productivity and address employment challenges for youth. This last need is perhaps the most imperative of all. It is indispensable to future stability.

In Afghanistan, our military efforts in Oruzgan province are complemented by similar development programmes. Our efforts to meet the population's needs have highlighted the inextricable link between military, diplomatic and development efforts in establishing a sustainable peace.

Finally, Australia agrees with the Secretary-General's assessment that there is a need to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, including from developing countries, to help develop national capacity in post-conflict societies. The Australian Civilian Corps was established in late 2009 to enable the rapid

deployment of Australian civilians into post-conflict countries in coordination with the local Government and other international actors. We look forward to playing an active part in the forthcoming review of international civilian capacities.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Pedro Serrano, acting head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations.

Mr. Serrano: Let me begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for having invited the European Union (EU) to this timely and important debate.

The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Serbia; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

Following the established practice, the full version of the European Union statement is being circulated. I will read out an abridged version.

At the outset, I wish to acknowledge the important statements delivered by the Foreign Minister of Japan, the Secretary-General, the ministers of Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and the Managing Director of the World Bank. Let me also commend you, Mr. President, for your personal commitment to the peacebuilding cause.

The follow-up to last year's report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), the 2010 Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) review, and the ongoing reflection on United Nations peacekeeping represent three key priority areas. The European Union will follow and engage in these processes very closely, and certainly in the implementation of the Secretary-General's report and the United Nations civilian capacity review.

On several occasions we have failed to break the cycle of crisis and have missed windows of opportunity for decisive action. The international community has witnessed too many countries relapsing into conflict within short periods of time. The figure of 30 per cent of countries falling back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement is unacceptable in terms of suffering, in terms of missed opportunities and in terms of lost investments. Reversing this trend is a shared responsibility and something we owe the people most affected by conflict.

Building peace is about much more than ending war. Peacebuilding aims at building a vital bridge between short-term crisis management and longer-term efforts to consolidate stability by preventing the recurrence of the conflict cycle through human development, State-building and support to civil society.

We have learned from our common experience over the past decades that no single template can be applied to complex situations in which priority areas span the areas of peace and security, development, humanitarian affairs, human rights and the rule of law, including the fight against impunity.

In order to meet this daunting challenge, the European Union believes that additional efforts should be devoted not only to generating greater national ownership as the foundation for peacebuilding efforts, including by supporting increased participation by women, but also to identifying credible priorities, to designing coherent peacebuilding strategies, to providing rapid, flexible and predictable financial support, and to forging effective national, regional and international partnerships.

The Peacebuilding Commission has the potential to champion that agenda. The case of Sierra Leone is an excellent example that demonstrates the PBC's added value. The European Union is contributing substantially to efforts there, while focusing on good governance, the rehabilitation of priority infrastructure and general budgetary support.

At present, the European Union is engaged worldwide in 12 civilian and military crisis management operations that cover a wide array of activities. We are also cooperating actively with the United Nations in eight different theatres.

The new structures for the management of the EU's external relations, under the leadership of High Representative Ashton, aim at bringing closer together all the instruments at the EU's disposal and at increasing the coherence of the European Union's short-, medium- and long-term actions.

In Timor-Leste, the European Union has provided more than $400 million since 1999 in development and humanitarian assistance. For the period 2009 to 2013, the European Union will continue to provide support to

the people of Timor-Leste, in the amount of $100 million, in areas such as rural development, health and food security, security sector reform and the social integration of internally displaced persons.

Finally, on Afghanistan, contributions to improving governance, electoral reform, the rule of law, respect for human rights and Afghan institution-building are at the heart of the European Union's support in that country. Through its action plan, the European Union, in cooperation with the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and other international partners, continues to provide long-term assistance to Afghanistan in institution building and civilian capacity programmes, including at the sub-national level.

Let me conclude by reiterating that we cannot fail to meet the challenge of supporting post-conflict countries in building lasting peace. The United Nations, with its global legitimacy and in close partnership and coordination with the main actors, has a central role to play. The European Union remains resolutely determined to actively support those collective efforts to better assist countries in building sustainable peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Finland.

Mr. Viinanen (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries, namely, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

Let me join others in thanking Japan for organizing this timely debate, and the Ministers for their valuable remarks.

Five years ago, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan observed that there was a gaping hole in the United Nations institutional machinery. No part of the United Nations system effectively addressed the challenge of helping countries with the transition from war to lasting peace. Member states agreed with Mr. Annan's observation. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund were established. This year, we are assessing how well they have filled that gap and how to improve common peacebuilding efforts. The Nordic countries will continue to stay actively engaged in the review process.

However, peacebuilding is not confined to the PBC alone, but also embraces the much broader scope of policies, interventions and processes, as this debate demonstrates. Indeed, it is very much a collaborative effort of the whole United Nations and beyond. Most important, it is a national task of the country recovering from conflict. We look forward to the discussion later this year on the results of the implementation of recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on Peacebuilding (S/2009/304).

Allow me to highlight a few points that the Nordic countries believe are important for the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, and for peacebuilding more generally.

Peace is much more than the mere absence of violence. Building sustainable peace requires much more than a short-term strategy for security, political stability and the initial dividends of economic recovery. Sustainable peace requires that the foundations of a peaceful society are restored and that a State be accountable to its people. It requires respect for the fundamental rights of each individual, professional and trustworthy rule of law and security institutions and a social compact based on an inclusive and transparent reconciliation process.

The current approach to peacebuilding falls well short of that vision. Mandates and strategies tend to concentrate on short-term deliverables, because ensuring measurable progress on security and political stability is so difficult. But we must try and, in so doing, we must acknowledge the diversity of post-conflict situations.

No peacebuilding policy will be valid in all post-conflict situations. What builds peace in one country does not necessarily build peace in another. International assistance to post-conflict countries must build on an understanding of the country context and allow for more flexibility and adaptability. The international community must move away from imposing unrealistic expectations and timelines for sweeping reforms, keeping in mind that sustainable peace requires a holistic long-term vision and resilience to stay on course.

National ownership built on an inclusive and transparent political process is the basis for effective peacebuilding interventions. That is why the review of the Peacebuilding Commission must focus on delivering added value at the national level and assess whether the United Nations peacebuilding architecture

is sufficiently able to foster and promote nationally owned and coordinated peacebuilding efforts.

The role of the international community, in our view, should be to ensure not only the principle of national ownership but also national accountability to the local population. While supporting transitional governmental structures, the international community should act as a guarantor of the emergence of truly inclusive political processes. Civil society needs to be supported and genuinely consulted. It goes without saying — even though I am saying it — that women, who make up more than half of the population, should be fully included in all peacebuilding and political processes from the beginning.

When the going gets difficult, and it will, it is the role of the international community to stay focused on the goal of inclusive national ownership while accepting necessary risks, including financial ones. That is mutual accountability and partnership with a society recovering from a conflict.

Coordination is another key pillar of mutual accountability. Countries recovering from conflict have to be able to expect a coordinated and supportive approach from the international community. That includes a more coordinated approach from the United Nations intergovernmental bodies, better integration of all relevant United Nations actors and improved coordination between the United Nations and other organizations, such as the international financial institutions. That requires leadership that is able to cut through turf battles. The Nordic countries encourage the Secretary-General and the Security Council to continue to demonstrate proactive leadership in their efforts to achieve that.

Finally, as Member States, we must also look at our own responsibilities. Coordination begins at home. We need to speak with one voice at all levels and pursue a consistent peacebuilding policy in the various multilateral and bilateral settings. As contributors to the broader peacebuilding architecture, we must recommit to that agenda, including by promoting and applying a whole-Government approach, however difficult and challenging that may be.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of India.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and for your concept note (S/2010/167).

At the outset, let me echo the Secretary-General's assertion in his report last year on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict. The imperative of national ownership and the anchoring of international peacebuilding efforts at the country level cannot be overemphasized.

Security is a key pillar of peacebuilding. It is equally important to focus on building economic opportunity, particularly for young people, along with political and social stability. This requires a holistic approach that is sensitive to the economic, social and political milieu of the post-conflict situation. It is also critical to ensure that there is a real stake for the country involved in the peacebuilding efforts. It also means that, even in cases where it is difficult to locate national ownership, international peacebuilding efforts are geared towards strengthening the capacity of a post-conflict State to govern effectively and to govern well. Capacity-building also assumes importance especially in instances where countries find it difficult to completely utilize the financial assistance with which they have been provided.

My delegation is therefore of the view that the international community, acting through the instrumentality of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), must always strive to ensure that there is effective two-way dialogue between countries on the agenda of the PBC and the Commission itself through all stages.

Another key issue is that of financing. Let us be clear and acknowledge the fact that the lack of funding continues to be a major impediment to the success of peacebuilding initiatives. It goes without saying that other elements — such as human resources, technical assistance, managerial assistance, assistance in kind and other programmes of assistance through the provision of appropriate technologies — are also important.

Given the sensitive nature of such peacebuilding tasks as security sector reform and development administration, there must be a high degree of coordination within the United Nations system. Work in the country-specific configurations has been a positive dimension. In particular, the Council would do well to really consult major troop- and police-contributing countries, both individually and through

the instrumentality of the PBC, while formulating and revising the mandates of United Nations missions.

India has shared its unique nation-building experience and expertise with a number of countries transiting from conflict to peace. We are very happy to continue to make available our capabilities in nation-building to countries in post-conflict situations and to cooperate with the United Nations in its various peacebuilding activities.

Ever since the creation of the PBC in December 2005, India has actively participated in its work as a member of its Organizational Committee and by contributing to the resources of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). We will continue this active association with the PBC and the PBF with a view to enabling those institutions to fulfil in their entirety the tasks assigned to them by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Further, we are of the view that the Fund should act as a catalyst for good governance. In this regard, we note with approval the creation of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities, in fulfilment of the agenda for action outlined by the Secretary-General in his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict.

We need to be cognizant that peacebuilding is still a concept in its infancy and is continuously evolving. The international community has taken on board the idea of peacebuilding to fulfil the important need of handling post-conflict situations. It is therefore imperative that we ensure that peacebuilding and the institutions that constitute the peacebuilding architecture are successful.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Solomon Islands.

Mr. Beck (Solomon Islands): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to acknowledge your country's initiative in convening this open debate on the topic "Post-conflict peacebuilding: comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict".

I contribute to the discussions as the representative of a country emerging from conflict and as a current recipient State under a Pacific peacebuilding model, led by Australia and strongly supported by New Zealand, together with the participation of the 14 other Pacific small island developing States. My country receives assistance under the regional arrangement known as the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI). The six-year old regional Mission is composed of military, police and civilian personnel. The relationship and partnership have generated a tsunami of valuable lessons that I hope will garner the interest of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and this Council.

The Pacific model is provided for under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter under the subheading "Regional arrangements". It is my wish and hope that we can draw on other peacebuilding experiences and take a fresh look at other models that will enrich today's debate.

I am mindful that our United Nations Peacebuilding Commission has a narrow agenda that focuses only on four countries. The question remains: What happens to other countries emerging from conflict? Who deals with them, if not the PBC?

In sharing my country's experience, let me give the Council some brief information on my country. Solomon Islands has a population of more than half a million people, speaking some 87 different languages. More than 85 per cent of the population is located in the rural areas. Back in late 1998, ethnic tension erupted, leading to a two-year conflict between two ethnic groups that brought the country to its knees and saw law and order take an ugly turn. RAMSI entered the country in 2003 at the invitation of the Government of Solomon Islands, and today continues to play a supporting role in rebuilding the country.

For many countries ravaged by wars, peacebuilding is about security, development and nation-building. Security is a priority in all early phases of peacemaking, and remains so within a changing environment. Sufficient investment must be made within the development sector if true peace is to be attained. This means that the PBC must understand the environment in which it is operating, be flexible in its approach in order to adapt to the changing environment and, most important, anticipate change in any form of crisis, be it climate change, energy, food or financial. Any of these crises will shock national systems and exacerbate the problems therein.

Security, human rights and the rule of law naturally follow the lead of development. The argument is that we cannot guarantee security or human rights to populations until they are provided with economic opportunities and become active

participants in the economy; otherwise, any peace gain will remain fragile and unpredictable.

On security sector reform, if any peacebuilding mechanism is to succeed, it is important that confidence in the State institutions be restored. This means allowing the State to lead in all initiatives and providing it with the necessary tools and equipment. The United Nations can build confidence in State institutions by providing space for locally trained police forces to participate in the Organization's missions. This would be tantamount to a pronouncement and announcement by the international community that public trust in new State security institutions has been restored.

On Governance, more attention also must be paid to provincial and community governance structures. In many peacebuilding initiatives, the focus remains on State institutions within the capital. The paucity of investment in the other arms of Government outside capitals have hampered States in their efforts to carry out their core functions on behalf of their scattered populations.

Many of the governance systems adopted by developing countries do not always recognize traditional and customary laws in a specific way. At times, modern legislation clashes with traditional mechanisms. These are issues that should not be allowed to fester and grow.

One area I wish to bring to the Council's attention, and that is not covered in the concept paper before the Council (S/2010/167), is that of partnership between the PBC and the receiving State and the management of that relationship. Solomon Islands enjoys stability under the RAMSI partnership. However, sporadic flare-ups on the law and order front have allowed Solomon Islands and RAMSI to fine-tune their cooperation in containing emerging national security problems. The partnership framework, previously referred to by New Zealand, provides for dynamic and robust cooperation between the two parties.

There must be a smart partnership between the PBC and the receiving State — a partnership that is about increasing the State's system-wide capacity with skills and support to improve its delivery of services to its populations; that addresses the underlying causes of conflict; and that avoids ad hoc coordination assistance outside the Government machinery and an unbalanced assistance that further undermines the State, making the support unsustainable in the long run and turning State actors into spectators.

My final point concerns international efforts. Any country emerging from conflict must be able to create funds from within the State. In the Solomon Islands, this can be done with investment in selected areas, such as energy, which accounts for a third of its national budget, and agriculture, mainly in rice. This will free up millions of dollars in allowing the country to ensure that much of its peacebuilding programme is sustainable.

Let me close, Sir, by once again thanking you for this opportunity. I also take this opportunity to thank my Pacific colleagues — in particular Australia, New Zealand and my colleagues from the Pacific small island developing States — for their support to the Solomon Islands via the Regional Assistance Mission.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of El Salvador.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes your initiative, Sir, to convene this open debate of the Security Council on post-conflict peacebuilding, in particular during this year, 2010, when we will review the progress made by and challenges facing the Peacebuilding Commission five years after its creation. We also thank the Secretary-General for his ongoing support for peacebuilding efforts through the Peacebuilding Support Office and his leadership at the head of the Peacebuilding Fund.

El Salvador reaffirms its commitment to the objectives and goals of the Peacebuilding Commission, given the Commission's significant contribution in support of the efforts of countries emerging from conflicts, in particular those now on the Commission's agenda.

It is also worth noting the importance of the valuable lessons learned that we have been able to identify collectively within the framework of the Commission's Working Group on Lessons Learned, which El Salvador was honoured to chair for three years. These lessons must serve us in all peacebuilding processes being carried out in countries on the agenda of the Commission, as well as in others.

We are aware that each conflict has its own specificities. The Commission must therefore make an

even greater effort to promote a comprehensive approach that devotes special attention to these particular characteristics and also takes into account the priorities agreed upon by domestic actors and national ownership. In this regard, my delegation wishes to reiterate the need to continue to involve all relevant bodies of the United Nations system in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, including the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies, in particular the agencies, funds and programmes that, let us not forget, are carrying out operational activities for development in the field.

The country-specific configurations continue to play a special role in the activities of the Commission. In this regard, the effectiveness of their work is essential if we wish to achieve the goals and objectives that the Peacebuilding Commission has set for itself. We also recall the importance of strengthening coordination and cooperation among the various national and international actors in the field and here at Headquarters, in order to ensure that the synergies that emerge between the two can make an effective contribution to Governments' national peacebuilding efforts and do not become an obstacle to the process.

Moreover, in the view of my delegation, the time is ripe for us to give further thought to the nature, scope and time frame in which the comprehensive peacebuilding strategy is to be carried out. While this tool was provided for in the founding resolutions of the Commission, practice has demonstrated that we need to show some flexibility during the design and implementation phase so that it does not become an obstacle to the peacebuilding process. Furthermore, it is important for the Commission to seriously consider those elements or conditions that must be observed in the deployment of an exit strategy. The Commission's work in a given country cannot last indefinitely. The successful experience of El Salvador is proof of that.

The Security Council undoubtedly has an important role to play in supporting the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. Therefore, we believe it appropriate to strengthen the channels of communication and exchange of views between this organ, the country-specific configurations and, in a broader context, the Commission's Organizational Committee.

In the view of El Salvador, the Security Council, acting in coordination with the General Assembly, can provide a genuinely strategic, more in-depth vision for the Peacebuilding Commission. In addition, the existing ties between peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations can be strengthened. This relationship must also be reflected in greater cooperation between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Peacebuilding Support Office in order to maximalize the vision, the follow-up and, of course, resources. We also believe it important to strengthen synergies and coherence between the strategies of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, and to redouble in turn the cooperative efforts between the Commission and relevant regional bodies.

In conclusion, let me reiterate the conviction of the Government of El Salvador that the new peacebuilding architecture is a very valuable tool for the international community to the extent that it will enable us to meet the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. That will benefit peacekeeping and security worldwide, as well as peoples that, like ours, have undertaken efforts to build lasting peace.

The President: I call on the representative of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka): My delegation appreciates the initiative of the Japanese presidency in organizing this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. It is a most timely initiative. I also wish to extend, on behalf of my delegation, our warmest greetings to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan and the other Ministers who are with us here today for this important meeting.

Sri Lanka associates itself fully with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The United Nations, as we all know, was established in the hope that it would contribute to the collective effort to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We can all take pride in the fact that, in the 65 years since then, the world as a whole has not been at war. However, in the same period, intra-State and inter-State conflicts have become widespread. Therefore, our collective efforts to bring conflicts to an end and to prevent the recurrence of conflicts in post-conflict contexts cannot cease.

The Peacebuilding Commission was conceived with an awareness of the characteristics of successful peacebuilding efforts. We must nevertheless not ignore

the lessons of the other home-grown strategies that countries have successfully implemented to achieve and consolidate peace. There are many instances in which strategies developed on the basis of national experience have succeeded much better than those prescribed in hallowed academic institutions. We must accept that all peacebuilding efforts are unique, as the nature and context of individual conflicts are different. There must be no one-size-fits-all principle applied in supporting the specific situation of any given country. Any tendency to impose predetermined solutions for achieving peace and reconciliation must be resisted, however much we are attached to them.

We recognize that the international community has a responsibility to ensure that post-conflict situations do not relapse into conflict and to encourage and facilitate national efforts to achieve lasting peace. We need to listen to national Governments and communities, which understand better what a country's and a people's priorities are. Peacebuilding must squarely be a nationally owned process, and peace must come from within and not from the outside. Our own experience has shown that some in the international community expect benchmarks to be achieved according to artificial timelines and feel that external pressure could help speed up a process, disregarding complex domestic sensitivities and ground realities. Quite often, the progress made is ignored when it is not consistent with external prescriptions, and there is a constant focus only on what remains to be achieved. This approach has resulted quite often in the rejection of external interference and confusion in the domestic processes, thereby weakening the influence of the international community.

In many situations, time can heal many wounds, provided it is augmented by necessary confidence-building measures. Quite often, a great deal of emphasis is placed on political reconciliation alone, without the realization that the economic empowerment of people needs to be given equal priority. Poverty, unemployment, unequal opportunities and an ensuing sense of grievance have often led to the radicalization of communities and provided the base of support for armed conflict. Whilst these social issues may manifest themselves as ethno-national or religious conflicts, the core grievance may very possibly be a sense of marginalization, especially economic.

Peacebuilding is a multidimensional task that requires a comprehensive approach. The immediate needs of people in post-conflict societies include rehabilitation, resettlement, basic services, safety and security, the rebuilding of basic infrastructure, economic opportunities through employment and the regaining of lost livelihoods. Unless economic opportunities are provided, no amount of political facilitation or punitive measures will bring peace. One classic definition of peace is the normalization of the life of the people. No peacebuilding can be successful without winning the hearts and minds of the people. Economic recovery must take place in parallel with the strengthening of democratic processes, the rule of law and human rights. The international community has a significant role to play in assisting with the economic recovery phase in post-conflict scenarios.

Considerable focus needs to be placed on healing the wounds and achieving reconciliation among peoples in countries where conflicts have divided communities for decades. Those who shout from the rooftops for justice or revenge against the alleged perpetrators of crimes come from a certain socio-cultural milieu where revenge is seen as a healer. In our part of the world, a culture going back millennia dictates that mercy must be shown by the victor. Mercy, forgiveness and a need to come to terms with the past, however bitter it may have been, on a morally acceptable basis, in order to advance the cause of reconciliation and long-term stability are key to our cultural experience. As the Bard so aptly wrote of the quality of mercy "is twice blest. It blesseth him that gives and him that takes". Forgiveness, rather than punishment and revenge, is the major influence in our context. Therefore, we need to recognize the different approaches to addressing the ways conflicts last and can be resolved, and once again agree that there is no one-size-fits-all formula.

Our own experience has shown us that we must allow democratic processes to be established for the people to elect their leaders and to allow the people who have lived through years of conflict to come forward and take the initiative in rebuilding their communities and deciding their political future, rather than having solutions based on a judgmental assessment of their aspirations imposed upon them. Those who have been through long-running conflicts often take a very different approach to how they would want to shape their future, and, very often, old ideas

that gave rise to the conflicts in the first place no longer remain a priority for these communities. Therefore, political solutions in post-conflict societies, in our experience, should not precede the firm establishment of democratic processes and proper consultation.

Post-conflict peacebuilding also requires considerable financial resources, and, in many countries emerging from conflict, one of the major challenges is finding the resources to consolidate peace. Very often, support from the donor community is conditional upon our accepting its formulas for peacebuilding. We believe that the Peacebuilding Fund could be a channel through which national processes can be supported on their own merits.

We hope that our candid views on post-conflict peace building strategies based on our own experience may contribute to the ongoing dialogue on how best to sustain and achieve durable peace. Sri Lanka fully supports the major review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture being conducted under the auspices of the General Assembly, and we hope this debate may contribute to that review.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ghana.

Mr. Christian (Ghana): On behalf of the delegation of Ghana, I wish to congratulate Japan on its assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April and on having organized this debate. I also congratulate Gabon on having ably presided over the affairs of the Council in March. We appreciate the statement made by the Secretary-General this morning.

When, in April 2005, the Governments of Ghana and Denmark jointly organized a workshop on peacebuilding in Accra to mobilize support for the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), many participants had no doubt in their minds that peacebuilding pre-dated the PBC. Nonetheless, they were quite convinced that the notion of peacebuilding — as variously articulated in the reports of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) and "In Larger Freedom" (A/59/2005) — was that it should enable the United Nations to add value by filling an institutional gap and ensuring that peacebuilding efforts became sustainable and effective. In the ongoing review exercise, the added value of the PBC must be kept in mind.

The goal of attaining sustainable peace is not an event, but a process requiring the sustained attention of the international community. To be sustainable, peacebuilding processes should aim at deepening the culture of peace, democracy and respect for the rule of law, justice, human rights and international legality.

The PBC is a conflict-prevention mechanism to the extent that it is mandated to mobilize resources and seek the support of the international community to prevent post-conflict countries from suffering relapses. Thus, in the course of the ongoing review exercise, attention should be given to the need to strengthen the PBC as an early warning mechanism, relying on lessons learned not only for the benefit of countries on its agenda that stand the risk of relapsing into violent conflicts, but also for pre-conflict countries.

This perspective may be better appreciated when one considers that, in some cases, the international community has failed to respond in a timely manner when danger has loomed in some countries in post-conflict situations, as the peace they had once enjoyed was taken for granted. The PBC should be able to advise the Security Council on situations on the Council's agenda, taking advantage of the lessons learned in cases where there is credible information pointing to the possibility of a violent conflict occurring while giving due deference to national sensitivities. In doing so, the PBC would fulfil the objective of filling an institutional gap within the conflict-prevention apparatus of the United Nations in a more holistic and comprehensive manner.

The PBC must pay equal, if not more, attention to the need to mobilize not only the international community but also national stakeholders for sustainable peace, as a nation cannot have peace without the active engagement of its homegrown peacebuilders. Thus, although Ghana is not a country in a post-conflict situation, it is now implementing a peacebuilding framework, the National Architecture for Peace in Ghana. The broad policy objective is to facilitate the development of mechanisms for cooperation among all the relevant stakeholders in peacebuilding in Ghana by institutionalizing responses to conflicts aimed at achieving social, political and religious reconciliation and transformative dialogues. The National Architecture also includes the introduction of the culture of peace into the curriculum of schools in Ghana and building the capacity of national and local institutions to manage grievances in

a democratic environment anchored in the rule of law and access to justice. A key component of this architecture is the promotion of free and independent media to create a space for public debates on issues before the nation in a manner that allows all voices to be heard without fear.

The National Architecture for Peace in Ghana obviously takes inspiration from the national Constitution, which provides for an independent judiciary, an independent media free from all governmental control, and an independent electoral commission, as well as the directive principles of State policy, which call for equitable national development and social inclusiveness and non-discrimination.

Education should play a key role in almost all the national dimensions of peacebuilding identified in the concept paper for this debate (S/2010/167), whether they be security sector reform, the reintegration of soldiers, alleviating poverty and unemployment, avoiding discrimination against women or ensuring gender balance. For example, a society cannot effectively integrate its former child soldiers or help them to obtain decent jobs without first giving them books instead of bullets. High unemployment among women and girls can be mitigated by ending discrimination against women in many societies in the areas of access to education and social life. In recognition of the value of education, Ghana's national Constitution provides for free, compulsory universal basic education targeting girls and boys in equal measure. To this end, Ghana welcomes the efforts by the PBC and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon aimed at mainstreaming women in peacebuilding.

Ghana also welcomes the emphasis placed on national ownership. In the context of ensuring sustainable peace in post-conflict countries, the principle of respect for national ownership or sovereignty should accommodate the principle of solidarity. Ghana will therefore urge the PBC to continue to explore appropriate strategies to engage regional and subregional organizations in order to enhance coordination and coherence through an integrated approach to the delivery of their respective peacebuilding mandates, in collaboration with civil society and donors.

The promotion of coordination and cooperation among various stakeholders interested in assisting countries on the PBC agenda will help minimize or avoid situations in which national authorities are compelled to choose between conflicting priorities that might be set by competing stakeholders in such a way that competition to claim exclusive peacebuilding credit becomes the enemy of cooperation.

Ghana acknowledges the efforts made by successive Presidents of the PBC and Chairpersons of the country-specific configurations to reach out to the African Union (AU) in order to dialogue on peacebuilding issues. However, more needs to be done to achieve an effective triangulation of efforts among the United Nations, the AU or the regional organization concerned, and the countries on the PBC's agenda in order to more effectively deliver as one. It is the Ghana delegation's view that, to this end, the convening of a joint session of the PBC and the AU Peace and Security Council to review the peacebuilding strategy for the countries on the PBC's agenda would be a step in the right direction.

In the area of capacity-building, the mere existence of the Peacebuilding Commission should not lead to a misleading assumption that the United Nations is adequately equipped with the requisite range of tools — be they human and material resources, information or other — to carry out peacebuilding tasks, let alone to assist countries on its agenda to improve their capacity for post-conflict peace consolidation. The test of any effective peacebuilding capacity should be to pose the question "the capacity to do what?" and to put in place the appropriate monitoring or evaluation mechanisms to ensure the effectiveness of capacity-building for peacebuilding.

The adoption of the African Union Framework for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development speaks to the necessity to look at development in a broad sense in terms of its contribution to peace consolidation, thereby moving beyond the question, often asked, of whether the PBC is designed to handle development. Moreover, peacebuilding and peacekeeping should not be seen as mutually exclusive. The question that must be addressed is how to employ the entire available and legitimate range of tools and resources in order to prevent a country in a post-conflict situation from relapsing into violent conflict and to ensure that it is in a position to achieve sustainable peace, including by addressing the root causes.

We hope that Ghana's statement will contribute to the search for ways to move the United Nations peacebuilding agenda forward.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Rwanda.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. Let me join others in commending your delegation for convening this debate and for the instructive concept note (S/2010/167) distributed to facilitate this discussion. We are grateful for and welcome the opportunity to contribute to this debate, and we thank the Secretary-General and all those who have put forward recommendations that we believe will greatly enhance our consideration of this issue.

Many post-conflict reconstruction efforts tend to follow a common path, establishing a semblance of a functioning administration, providing security and economic recovery in order to create prosperity, and empowering citizens to take ownership in democratic governance. However, despite these similarities, we should remember that each situation is unique to its own specific historical context. Allow me therefore to make the following points in contribution to this debate.

To realize effective peacebuilding in post-conflict countries, emphasis should be placed on national ownership. Post-conflict needs are evident, and peacebuilding plays a significant role in mitigating and addressing those needs. As such, peacebuilding should be given adequate and appropriate support in the form of human and financial resources.

The creation of an effective and efficient peacebuilding architecture is crucial to conducting and operationalizing peacebuilding mandates. It is equally important to have a mechanism for mutual accountability that monitors the commitments of all actors.

Post-conflict management should avoid leaving a vacuum that could lead to a recurrence of violence. If peacebuilding is to fill the gap, there must be effective coordination among the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Peacebuilding should involve the formulation of an exit strategy and should avoid perpetual dependency.

We are encouraged by the leadership the German delegation brings to the PBC and, in particular, by the focused approach on those issues, which we believe will make the Peacebuilding Commission perform better.

In conclusion, if there is any lesson to be learned from Rwanda's reconstruction experience, it is that there is a need to understand the root causes of conflict and to address them, using universal values that incorporate home-grown solutions.

The President: I give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Téte António, Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

Mr. António (*spoke in French*): Given the lateness of the hour, I shall not read out my prepared text but will instead sum up my ideas. First, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting. This morning we carefully listened to the statements of the Secretary-General, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministers from Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and of course, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan.

We commend this innovative initiative. This morning we had an opportunity not only to listen to countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, but we also heard about interesting efforts, which could serve as lessons, from countries that are not on the Commission's agenda. I believe that we will take those experiences into account when we undertake the review exercise.

In speaking of the African Union I will limit myself to reiterating comments made earlier by the representative of Ghana. As the Council is aware, the African Union has developed its Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development aimed at ensuring that countries do not relapse into conflict. Above all, we have included the development aspect in our approach. We have had the opportunity to address the Council on the value of the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations considering the development aspect when addressing peacebuilding issues. I believe that is a gap that we should not fear addressing when reviewing the Peacebuilding Commission.

The African Union has also incorporated the root causes into its approach: we believe it is impossible to

build peace without addressing the root causes of conflict. I think that too is a contribution that could also be used in the United Nations approach to peacebuilding.

The African Union Policy Framework is based on certain principles such as national ownership, African leadership, non-discrimination and, in particular, inclusiveness. We know that partnerships are necessary to achieve all the aims of peacebuilding. Thus we propose the creation of an institutionalized partnership between the multidimensional communities involved in the African Union Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development on the one hand and the Peacebuilding Commission on the other.

Steps have already been taken. The African Union and the Peacebuilding Commission have already met, and the Chair of the PBC visited Addis Ababa with a large delegation. We must see how to transform our discussions into reality. There was also a meeting with the African Union Peace and Security Council, which is an important element of the African Union's peace and security structure. Meetings between the African Union Peace and Security Council and the United Nations Security Council should be more than just pro forma encounters. We must ensure that these meetings lead to facts with a genuine impact on the partnership we are building with the United Nations.

I think there are already lessons to be learned from work on the ground. As the Council is aware, the United Nations and the African Union are involved in Darfur through the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur. I think there are lessons being learned there that could also prove useful in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission and in the approach being developed by the United Nations.

The representative of Ghana was very eloquent in addressing the regional aspect. We need to truly involve the regions in peacebuilding. Ghana proposed a far more integrated approach for cooperation among the United Nations, the African Union and the regional organizations, and we fully support that approach.

In practice, the African Union is currently involved on the ground through its regional and other offices and through its special envoys. We have undertaken efforts in certain countries on the Peacebuilding Commission agenda. There are situations that are of concern, such as that in Guinea-Bissau, which the Peace and Security Council and the Security Council have been addressing. We believe that the expected outcome will not occur until defence and security sector reform has occurred in that country. We therefore need to encourage regional efforts — those of the Economic Community of West African States and the African Union — and also to encourage bilateral cooperation: I think there are countries, even on the African continent, that are interested in helping Guinea-Bissau. Thus it is important to encourage such bilateral cooperation.

There are other salient aspects in countries where the Peacebuilding Commission is involved. I am thinking, for example, of youth employment. Numerous delegations have repeatedly addressed this issue in the Security Council and in the Peacebuilding Commission. We cannot build peace unless we build a future for young people. Young people are the future, and unless they have support and a future before them, there is little point in talking about peacebuilding.

Of late, we have come before the Security Council a number of times to discuss various aspects of peacebuilding. We have spoken of exit strategies and of post-conflict peacebuilding, which is what we are discussing today. Perhaps we should now think about how we are going to turn the results of all of these discussions into reality and about how they will have an impact on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, which we are in the process of reviewing.

We also listened with great interest to the Secretary-General's statement this morning, in particular with regard to the establishment of an advisory group to be led by Mr. Guéhenno, with whose experience we are all familiar. It would be desirable for that advisory group to work in close coordination with the Peacebuilding Commission and all partners.

Above all, we would like to emphasize the point made about the need to listen to those who are involved in peacebuilding on a daily basis, that is, the people concerned. In that connection, we welcome the initiative of the facilitators of the PBC review process to go to Addis Ababa to speak to the Commission.

We also know that South Africa — and I stand to be corrected — is considering organizing a seminar with non-governmental organizations and populations on the ground who are suffering every day and who know what it is to have peace or not. I think these are the types of forums that we need to encourage in order to move forward effectively in this effort.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Srivali (Thailand): Thailand would like to thank Japan for organizing this timely debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and for its excellent and comprehensive concept paper (S/2010/167). Thailand aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

We wish to emphasize three aspects of peacebuilding that we believe are crucial to its success. The first is the need to foster national ownership, which many delegations have mentioned. National ownership must be accompanied by the strengthening of national capacity. Indispensable to that idea is the notion of nation-building — a process whereby all stakeholders and their interests are integrated into a set of shared goals, norms and values. In post-conflict societies, that means that institutions of governance and operational mechanisms will have to be developed that not only conform to international standards, but also reflect local needs and conditions.

Building a sense of national ownership therefore goes beyond the simple transfer of administrative power to local authorities. It also requires constant recalibration and continuous dialogue between the national Government and local constituents, including civil society and minorities. It may also require continued consultation and coordination with the international community, at least in the initial stages.

The second is the participation of women and youth. Since it is mostly men who are participants in conflict, it is important to bring out the role of women to help stabilize post-conflict environments. At the same time, the element of unemployed and undereducated youth is a potential risk factor that must be addressed in order to prevent a society from relapsing into conflict. The economic empowerment of women and youth could help dampen the potential root causes of conflict and encourage greater ownership in the peacebuilding process. Programmes in such areas as general education, literacy and vocational training should therefore be given high priority in order to ensure the sustainability of peace.

The third point that my delegation wishes to emphasize is that the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and sustainable development should be seamless. It can be difficult to pinpoint exactly where peacekeeping ends and peacebuilding begins. There will inevitably be a period of overlap where coordination among all parties involved is essential to ensure the coherence of the process. We therefore encourage close cooperation and consultation between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and other United Nations bodies, especially the Economic and Social Council, as well as other United Nations agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF. The PBC should also draw upon experiences and best practices in the United Nations system to enhance peacebuilding activities. In addition, close cooperation with international financial institutions and private foundations can help to address financing gaps and urgent needs, improve financing efficiency, avoid the duplication of work and ensure coherence in peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is an enormously complex and multifaceted task. As a member of the PBC Organizational Committee, Thailand is committed to continuing to work closely with our partners to further improve and strengthen the Commission. We hope that the 2010 PBC review will result in a more efficient, flexible and adaptive approach to peacebuilding challenges in post-conflict situations around the world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Ntwaagae (Botswana): Botswana is pleased to see you, Sir, personally presiding over the business of the Council today. We have no doubt that, under your presidency, the Council will surpass all expectations in the conduct of its work.

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Botswana attaches great importance to the promotion of post-conflict peacebuilding. In that connection, we welcome your initiative, Mr. President, to hold this Security Council open debate on the subject. Let me also commend you for inviting the eminent persons who were with us for the major part of the morning and who are with us today, all of whom have unrivalled knowledge and experience in the subject matter of today's debate.

We were also pleased and satisfied to take note of the presence of the Secretary-General here this morning, as well as the Ministers from Afghanistan,

Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. Their presence here demonstrated the great importance of the subject matter under discussions, as well as that of the issue of comprehensive peacebuilding to prevent the recurrence of conflict. Let me also recognize the presence of the Permanent Representative of Germany, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, whom I wish to commend for his effective stewardship of that body.

Botswana maintains that it is important to ensure collaboration and synergy in the programmes and activities of the various United Nations entities — such as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — in the broad area of peacebuilding and the management of conflict. This open debate is a perfect example of such coordination and collaboration.

We all agree that peace, safety and stability are prerequisites for the achievement of sustainable development. The causes of conflict, particularly in Africa, include the absence of political tolerance, democracy, good governance and the rule of law, as well as the inequitable distribution of revenue earned from natural resources within States. Botswana therefore wishes to emphasize the significance of supporting the democratization process and institutional development as crucial measures for the prevention of conflict and the laying of the foundation for sustainable socio-economic development.

In order to leave a positive mark where peacebuilding interventions are made, we must ensure effective coordination between the United Nations, host Governments, bilateral donors and civil society so that the delivery of all well-intended international assistance encourages national ownership and observes strict procedures to minimize the unintended sponsorship of conflict. Botswana also believes that investing in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of physical infrastructure, as well as in social and economic programmes, is a vital part of post-conflict reconstruction.

Addressing the needs and challenges of such vulnerable groups as youth, children, women, the disabled and the injured should be an integral part of effective peacebuilding. That is all the more significant because those groups of victims usually play little or no role at all in the incitement, planning and execution of violent conflict, but suffer the most from its effects. Peacebuilding initiatives should therefore be accompanied by relief efforts and the provision of infrastructure such as schools, water reticulation systems, primary health care and related services, and the revitalization of key economic sectors.

Botswana believes that post-conflict peacebuilding can succeed if we place a high premium on the national ownership of not only actual reconstruction activities, but also in determining the development priorities for which international assistance is being provided.

We are pleased, Mr. President, that you have convened this open debate at a time when we are preparing for the mandated review of the Peacebuilding Commission this year. It is very important that the ideas generated during this debate be allowed to feed into the review process. In that regard, Botswana supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement at the end of this open debate.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate Botswana's commitment to the realization of global peace and security as a prerequisite to development, dignified human existence, effective governance and the pursuit of prosperity. We cannot overemphasize the need for cooperation at the regional, bilateral and international levels, as well as cooperation among the various United Nations entities, in order to attain long-term peace, stability and development through processes accepted by all at the strategic, operational and institutional levels.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to commend the delegation of Japan for having convened this open debate, whose intrinsic importance was underscored by the presence this morning of important officials. Who better than the representatives of the countries that have experienced such a crucial transitional phase and achieved positive results to illustrate for us — through their experiences, mistakes and successes – that each case is different and to remind us that we cannot effectively apply a single approach to differing situations?

Peacebuilding is a complex long- and medium-term process that encompasses a broad range of tasks and stakeholders that require coordination and coherence. The United Nations is certainly just one of the actors involved. In many cases, it is not the most

relevant one — at least when it comes to financial contributions, which are a crucial element in such a critical phase. Nevertheless, due to the unique legitimacy derived from its universally representative character, it is of course the United Nations that is expected to play a central role in mobilizing and coordinating support to countries emerging from conflict.

Nevertheless, given that peacebuilding encompasses a considerable range of thematic issues and owing to the very structure of the Organization, when it comes to making that concept a reality, significant challenges arise within the United Nations system in the areas of leadership, coordination and the definition of responsibilities, which we need to address. The establishment of a body specifically mandated to take up this issue should have helped, in large measure, to resolve this problem. However, in spite of the substantial contribution made by the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since its inception, in particular in countries on its agenda, its place within the Organization and the support resources at its disposal are insufficient to maximize its potential.

In that regard, although there seems to be a certain degree of consensus as to the need to strengthen the PBC, we also have the impression that, in the context of the difficult review process currently under way, substantive differences exist as to its role and structure. To that end, we could focus on making timely and viable changes that strengthen the PBC and, above all, try to increase its added value on the ground. We have trust in the leadership of the Chair of the Organizational Committee, as well as in the work of the facilitators, to achieve a positive outcome to the current review process.

Along with its legitimacy, the United Nations has a comparative advantage in helping affected countries to define comprehensive and integrated peacebuilding strategies, which are crucial to ensuring sustainable peace and development. In that regard, as we have said on other occasions, there can hardly be sustainable peace in countries emerging from armed conflict if the causes of those conflicts are not addressed.

Security sector reform is another extremely important thematic area in which the United Nations can bring relevant added value. In this as in other areas, it is essential to enjoy abundant and flexible financial and human resources. In that connection, we should keep especially in mind the comparative advantage of civilian experts from developing countries. That will require the expanded use of South-South and triangular cooperation mechanisms. We should also make maximal use of the presence of Blue Helmets in carrying out peacebuilding tasks.

It is indisputable that there can be no development without security. However, security alone is not enough to sustainably consolidate stability and peace. Any peacebuilding strategy should therefore include elements that serve to promote social and economic development.

Although when we talk about strategies we tend to think about the medium and long terms, it is essential that we keep in mind the immediate and short-term dimensions in the aftermath of a conflict so as to produce tangible results – such as the restoration of basic services – at the onset of peace processes. In doing so, in addition to appreciating the inherent benefits of peace, the parties would see the desirability of having launched such a process. That would also serve to generate trust among the parties involved.

In conclusion, with regard to the guiding principles of peacebuilding efforts, allow me to point out that it can indeed seem nearly impossible to find broad consensus in the formulation of an agreed national strategy in politically and ethnically divided societies that have just torn themselves apart. The principle of national ownership can also appear to be an empty concept in devastated countries with limited institutional capacity. Nevertheless, it is the best way to proceed not just because it is the most correct politically, but because it avoids sowing the seeds of discord and resurgent conflict. It is the way to promote sustainable peace.

Therefore, above and beyond the existing differences in each situation, when the international community finds in a given country emerging from conflict leadership that is clear, conciliatory and able to achieve political stability and national reconciliation, it should not squander the opportunity to decisively and sustainably promote its efforts to consolidate peace and to promote economic and social development. The examples we have heard today speak to that. The counter-weight would be a transparent and reciprocal mechanism of accountability among all stakeholders involved.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Momem (Bangladesh): My delegation commends the Japanese presidency for having organized this timely debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. I thank the Secretary-General for his comments earlier in the day. I also thank the Ministers of Japan, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste and Bosnia and Herzegovina, who participated in the debate today.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

The General Assembly is the main deliberative body of the United Nations, composed of representatives of all Member States, and is entrusted with the responsibility of addressing important questions relating to peace and security, among other significant matters. The Non-Aligned Movement hereby reiterates the crucial relevance of the General Assembly, while having regard for the powers and responsibilities of other organs in the fulfilment of their respective obligations.

This debate takes place against the backdrop of a major review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which is being conducted under the auspices of the General Assembly, as stipulated in resolution 60/180. The Movement seeks to reassure itself that the discussion in this Council is aimed at augmenting the efforts for a successful completion of that process.

It is the view of NAM that the potential inherent in the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) as an advisory body is far from being fully utilized. We should engage ourselves in defining how the PBC can capitalize on its current composition, in accordance with operative paragraph 4 of resolution 60/180, so as to draw on the competitive advantages and expertise of the diverse representation of the general membership in the Organizational Committee, in particular the representation of the United Nations Charter bodies.

The Non-Aligned Movement places significant value on the PBC, particularly its role in support of the national ownership — I repeat, national ownership — of post-conflict peacebuilding priority planning and initiatives. There is concurrence and broad consensus within the Commission that economic reconstruction and rehabilitation and job creation should be at the forefront of all efforts aimed at sustaining peace, initiating development and promoting post-conflict recovery.

Like any new and fledgling apparatus, the PBC has experienced difficulties in accomplishing its given mandate. Despite many challenges, the PBC has made good progress in addressing the challenges of the four countries on its agenda. I would like to highlight the following important issues that my group believes need to be addressed to strengthen the ability of the PBC to contribute actively to the efforts for post-conflict peacebuilding.

First, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should fully utilize the ongoing 2010 review to realize the potential inherent in the PBC as an advisory body to achieve its ultimate goal of preventing countries from relapsing into conflict.

Secondly, NAM highlights the need to clearly define how the PBC can ensure a successful peacebuilding strategy through a better coordination among all actors — including the international financial institutions, the United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, the private sector and civil society organizations that are operating on the ground — in order to maximize synergies in the peacebuilding process. In this regard, NAM stresses that, in crafting peacekeeping mandates, the Council should clearly define the role of peacekeeping operations in the peacebuilding process.

Thirdly, NAM strongly emphasizes the importance of partnerships and early investments to economic recovery and development in the peacebuilding process and in the sustenance of peace. The international community must ensure from the very beginning a coherent and predictable deployment of resources in countries emerging from conflict. NAM stresses that that there can be no lasting peace without development, and no sustainable development without stability.

Fourthly, NAM reiterates that it is of the utmost importance that the gender perspective be reflected as an essential element in the peacebuilding process.

Fifthly, the PBC should continue to work in cooperation with national or transitional authorities in full conformity with the principle of national ownership.

Finally, the PBC needs to develop a more dynamic relationship with the Secretary-General with a view to providing effective guidance to the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations. In this respect, it is imperative to strengthen the capacity of the Peacebuilding Support Office with a view to promoting more integrated and strategic United Nations responses in post-conflict countries, keeping in mind the need for better support to peacebuilding activities on the ground.

Looking ahead, the Non-Aligned Movement is convinced that the upcoming debate in the review process will undoubtedly contribute to strengthening the PBC in addressing critical peacebuilding needs. The Non-Aligned Movement believes that the debate in this Council will, of course, add value in gaining further momentum for the subsequent discussions on the 2010 review of the PBC now taking place in the General Assembly.

In closing, we should not lose sight of the urgent need to provide necessary support to the PBC with a view to fulfilling its mandate. A failure to do so will cast shadows in the minds of those who need our attention the most — the people who are suffering from the curse of conflict. We cannot and should not bypass, in the name of the scale and complexity of peacebuilding needs, the critical role that the PBC can play in bringing lasting peace and sustainable development to post-conflict countries.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Papua New Guinea.

Mr. Aisi (Papua New Guinea): I commend you, Mr. President, and the delegation of Japan for convening this important meeting of the Security Council. I would also commend the statement just delivered by our colleague, the Ambassador of Bangladesh.

This statement is in large part a reflection of our recent tragic experiences in the Bougainville conflict. But more importantly, in the context of this debate, the resolution of the Bougainville conflict under the auspices of the United Nations, this Council and our regional partners stands as a testament to a number of the core issues that this debate is centred upon.

We fully agree that we have to consider — as you, Sir, have rightly noted in your concept paper — "a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict" (*S/2010/167, annex*) and that the Security Council should "conduct a comprehensive policy review on an effective peacebuilding strategy" (*ibid., para. 1*).

On 16 June 2005, this Council wound up its seven-year mandate to oversee the resolution of the 10-year bloody civil conflict that had raged on the island of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea. Sadly and, indeed horribly, it is estimated that between 10,000 and 15,000 people — and maybe more — including women and children and touching all Papua New Guineans, lost their lives in what could have been an avoidable national tragedy.

A few months prior to the end of the mandate, between 20 May and 9 June 2005, the first general elections for President and members of the House of Representatives were successfully completed, resulting in the establishment of the Autonomous Bougainville Government. That historic election was made possible under the agreed constitutional arrangements between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the leaders of Bougainville — a process that was critical to securing the lasting peace that continues to prevail today.

Contextually, the amending of our national Constitution was a testament to the notion that, ultimately, any peace process has to be nationally owned and driven. That a nation saw fit to amend its supreme law to facilitate a peace process remains a key factor in how the Bougainville peace process has been sustained. I am also pleased to report that the second general elections are currently under way, with the results to be finalized in June.

The United Nations, through the Security Council and its agencies, especially the Department of Political Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF, played pivotal roles in ensuring the continuing success of the peacebuilding process. Our neighbouring countries in the Pacific region — namely, Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Tonga and your own country, Mr. President, Japan — along with our regional agencies also participated in that process, at different levels and in different ways, thereby contributing to the continuing success of the peacebuilding process. This strongly underlines the view — and it is also our view — that any successful peace process must always have a strong element of partnership.

In our view, along with the idea of partnerships, there is a need for stronger application of the provisions of Article 52 of the Charter, whose paragraph 1 provides for

> "regional arrangements ... for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations".

Paragraph 3 of the same Article also states that the Security Council should "encourage the development of pacific settlement of ... disputes through such regional arrangements". We would make the observation that, of course, article 52 does not impair the provisions of Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter.

Your delegation's reference in its concept paper, Mr. President, to the need to ensure social stability along with political stability is critical, important and timely. There can be no peace unless there is peace among the population. The need to reinforce civilian capacities is therefore critical. Added to that is the need to empower women and, especially, youth. In the case of the latter, reintegration issues are critical if long-term peace is to be sustained. A peace dividend can only be realized if there is a concerted effort on the part of all parties concerned.

In conclusion, the Bougainville conflict, its resolution and the current peacebuilding process do not loom large in the global context. However, we believe that the United Nations and the Security Council should, in their attempt to review their comprehensive policy on an effective peacebuilding strategy, look to the Bougainville peace process in order to understand some of the dynamics that continue to contribute to the continuing success of that process.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): Thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this essential debate on peacebuilding-related issues. We also wish join previous speakers in thanking you, Sir, in your capacity as former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for your active involvement in addressing this important subject. We greatly value the presence of the Foreign Minister of Japan and other Ministers here today. We strongly support their statements.

Armenia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of the European Union. However, we would like to make some remarks in our national capacity.

The frequency with which the Security Council addresses post-conflict peacebuilding signifies the importance that the international community attaches to that issue as a preventive tool against the recurrence of conflict through the establishment of sustained security and stability, which are prerequisites for the maintenance of peace and development. It is also an acknowledgement of the Council's responsibility to fulfil the commitments undertaken to support countries that have emerged from conflict.

We share the views expressed by Council members and other speakers calling for more systematic attention to post-conflict peacebuilding, which we believe should be frequently reflected in the deliberations of the Security Council. We also believe that increased cooperation and the distribution of roles among the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions and regional organizations are essential.

Armenia remains committed to post-conflict peace initiatives and believes that the Security Council should further strengthen the rule of law and advance development initiatives by supporting peacebuilding mechanisms, such as the PBC, that help countries emerging from conflict in their recovery, reintegration and reconstruction efforts aimed at creating the foundations for sustainable peace and development. In that respect, it is important that the programmes adopted be country-specific, needs-based and target-oriented to ensure continued support from the people affected and to safeguard their success.

It is noteworthy that the PBC has shouldered for United Nations peacekeeping the important task of defining post-conflict strategies. We are encouraged that previous reports indicate that it has achieved certain satisfactory results in some countries.

Conflicts in the South Caucasus have defied peaceful accommodation, let alone resolution, for more than two decades. Wars have been fought, people displaced, law and order disrupted and economies shattered and paralysed. Yet, we have not fully employed an essential resource that could bring us

closer to peace: sustainable economic development. That could create regional opportunities for trade, investment and jobs and lead to engagement and solutions on the political front.

One might question the value of embarking on such an effort in post-conflict situations where negotiations among the parties are ongoing. However, international experience shows that economic cooperation and interaction can be a valuable confidence-building measure that often leads to political cohesion. Examples can be found in Western and Eastern Europe and, increasingly, in Asia.

With a view to achieving greater coherence in the region and expanding the geographical area for cooperation, the South Caucasus needs various regional initiatives and programmes sponsored by donor countries and organizations to be implemented. In addition, international financial institutions and private-sector contributions should play a decisive role in moving towards that end.

The region desperately awaits leadership from the global investment community. The ultimate task here is to translate that vision into working realities that emphasize the future instead of focusing on the painful past. The post-conflict period in the region provides a window of opportunity for providing basic security, delivering peace dividends, building confidence in the political process and strengthening core national ownership to lead peacebuilding efforts and lay the foundations for sustainable development.

The successful implementation of that agenda requires a basic level of political will and determination on the part of national and regional actors as preconditions for peacebuilding. With those political conditions in place, the ability of the United Nations or any other organization or intergovernmental or regional actor will be enhanced and supported. Armenia therefore welcomes the Japanese initiative to hold this open debate. This is an opportunity to recap and reflect on our past experiences in dealing with the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding and to highlight priority aspects for united practical actions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal.

Mr. Acharya (Nepal): I wish to begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding.

My delegation associates itself with the statement just made by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict peacebuilding efforts and their architecture are works in progress at the United Nations. Peacebuilding is a multidimensional approach to preventing war-torn countries from relapsing into a cycle of conflict. It has the important role of interposing itself amid security and normal development activities by nurturing an environment conducive to moving them onto the path of sustainable security, peace and socio-economic transformation. It therefore naturally encompasses diplomatic, security and economic efforts. We must not lose sight of that fundamental reality.

There is no doubt that security and development reinforce each other. There has to be a delicate balance between the two, so as to effectively lead a country towards the post-conflict phase. To achieve and sustain that, we should promote a coherent approach right from the beginning, with a view to ensuring national ownership of the whole process, by building capacity, dealing with immediate security challenges and promoting stabilizing activities through quick delivery of services and substantially ramped up development efforts.

We are all aware of the fragility of the transitional situation. Hence, the restoration of a modicum of security should immediately be followed by the simultaneous promotion of the political process, the consolidation of security and the effective promotion of employment-generating economic activities in order to instil hope in the minds of people. No other measure can surpass the positive effect of the early distribution of a peace dividend to the general public in generating hope and confidence for reconstruction and recovery. Very often, the cause of conflict has to do with deprivation. Therefore, ensuring effective and quick development works even in a minimum environment of security would be a great positive multiplier. This is where the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) should create a strong niche for itself.

The PBC has been envisaged as a specialized and nodal intergovernmental advisory body focusing on marshalling resources, raising the international profiles

of the countries on its agenda and coordinating peacebuilding activities there. It has now has been accepted as an important instrument in promoting peace and stability in some of countries emerging from conflict. However, it has yet to fully consolidate its work in the field or to make a strong mark on the ground. Better and robust coordination, coherence and collaboration on the field and at the regional and international levels would greatly enhance its effectiveness.

As peacebuilding is not a linear process, incorporating and coordinating peacebuilding activities from the early phase of peacekeeping greatly enhances its work. Similarly, the availability of substantial resources for peacebuilding, the effective and quick delivery of resources on the ground, and the further strengthening of the Peacebuilding Support Office would help better to consolidate peacebuilding efforts. In this context, my delegation is confident that the 2010 PBC review process will come up with concrete suggestions to make the PBC more effective and efficient in the days ahead. As a member of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, Nepal will make efforts towards that end.

Even though the peacebuilding environment varies from country to country, we see many commonalities in the approaches to and building blocks of peacebuilding. The accumulation of key components of effective peacebuilding would help to concentrate our focus on critical components of the peace process.

The time has come to consolidate our collective efforts and institutional settings to deal with the challenges of peacebuilding by promoting security, rehabilitation and recovery simultaneously with the substantial utilization of resources and our political capital. The United Nations has to nurture the hope and dreams of peace and economic prosperity of the millions of war-torn society. As has been stated often, if the international community, led by the United Nations system, responds rapidly, coherently and effectively, there is a greater chance of sustaining peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development. This could not be more true in the case of peacebuilding than in any other endeavour.

The President: Following consultations among the members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council recalls the statements of its President (S/PRST/2010/2, S/PRST/2009/23, S/PRST/2008/16) and emphasizes the critical importance of post-conflict peacebuilding as the foundation for building sustainable peace and development in the aftermath of conflict. The Council highlights the need for effective peacebuilding strategies to ensure durable peace and development.

"The Security Council recognizes that sustainable peacebuilding requires an integrated approach, which strengthens coherence between political, security, development, human rights and rule of law activities. The Council recognizes the important role that the United Nations can play in supporting national authorities to develop peacebuilding strategies that incrementally and comprehensively address priority needs. The Council encourages international partners to align their support behind these strategies at the international, regional, national and local levels.

"The Security Council reaffirms the importance of national ownership and the development of national capacity, and underscores that peacebuilding strategies should be considered in a country-specific context. In this regard, the Council recognizes the need for national authorities to take responsibility as soon as possible for reconstituting the institutions and functions of Government, with a view to addressing all key peacebuilding needs. The Council emphasizes that support for democratic, transparent and accountable governance is essential in order to achieve durable peace.

"The Security Council highlights the importance of the peaceful settlement of political disputes in a post-conflict State and addressing the sources of violent conflict as essential elements for achieving sustainable peace. The Council recognizes the importance of advancing the peace process and peaceful coexistence through inclusive dialogue, reconciliation and reintegration. The Council reaffirms that ending impunity is essential if a society recovering from conflict is to come to terms with past abuses committed against civilians affected by armed

conflict and to prevent such future abuses. The Council underlines the importance of holding free, fair and transparent elections for sustainable peace.

"The Security Council recognizes security sector reform as essential to the peacebuilding process and affirms that security sector reform should be nationally owned. Effective security sector reform requires developing a professional, effective and accountable security sector, in particular national police and military capacities under the civilian oversight of a democratic Government. The Council highlights the importance of a sector-wide approach for security sector reform, which enhances the rule of law, including through the establishment of an independent justice and correction systems. The Council requests the Secretary-General to include, where appropriate and mandated, in his reports on specific missions an indication of their progress in supporting national authorities towards achieving coordinated and comprehensive international support to nationally owned security sector reform programmes.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of pursuing political stability and security, alongside socio-economic development, for the consolidation of peace. The Council stresses the importance of delivering early peace dividends, including the provision of basic services, in order to help instil confidence and commitment to the peace process. The Council recognizes that the reintegration of refugees, internally displaced persons and former combatants, in coordination with security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, should not be seen in isolation, but should be carried out in the context of a broader search for peace, stability and development, with special emphasis on the revival of economic activities. The Council notes, in this regard, that high levels of youth unemployment can be a major challenge to sustainable peacebuilding.

"While recognizing the importance of developing State capacity, the Security Council also emphasizes the importance of increased attention and coherent policies to the reconstruction of conflict-affected communities and empowerment of affected people, in particular vulnerable civilians, such as children, the elderly, refugees and internally displaced persons. The Council takes note of the need for assistance for victims. The Council, in accordance with its resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), underlines the key role women and young persons can play in re-establishing the fabric of society, and stresses the need for their involvement in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies in order to take account of their perspectives and needs.

"The Security Council notes that drug-trafficking, organized crime, terrorism, illegal trafficking in arms and trafficking in people could constitute transnational threats with an impact on the consolidation of peace in countries emerging from conflict, and underlines the importance of increasing international and regional cooperation on the basis of common and shared responsibility to address them effectively.

"The Security Council reiterates the importance of launching peacebuilding assistance at the earliest possible stage. The Security Council recognizes the critical role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in addressing peacebuilding priorities, particularly through marshalling support and resources and improving planning and coordination for peacebuilding efforts. The Council further recognizes the need for greater coordination with the Commission and looks forward to the 2010 review of the PBC and the recommendations on how its role can be enhanced.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of enhancing coordination among relevant bilateral and multilateral donors to ensure predictable, coherent and timely financial support for post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council underscores that funding mechanisms for addressing immediate post-conflict needs, in particular the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), should play a catalytic role, which should be followed by more substantial, longer-term finance as soon as possible for the recovery and reconstruction efforts. The Council encourages greater synergy between the PBF and the PBC.

"The Security Council recognizes the need to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, in particular from developing countries and women, to help develop national capacity, and encourages Member States, the United Nations and other relevant partners to strengthen cooperation and coordination in building such capacities. The Council looks forward to the recommendations of the United Nations civilian capacity review in the Secretary-General's follow-up report of his report (S/2009/304).

"The Security Council emphasizes the need for the United Nations system to strengthen strategic partnerships with other international, regional and subregional organizations, as well as financial institutions, in particular by promoting coherence and coordination among their plans and programmes. In this connection, the Council looks forward to further strengthening of the cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank at both the Headquarters and field levels, and for the Secretary-General to include in the same follow-up report details of what steps have been made in generating more timely, predictable and accountable responses for the key peacebuilding sectors as requested."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2010/7.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.